The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 15, 1925 No. 3132

Troy Free Public SCHOOL LIBRARY Class

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 83
EDITORIALS:
- Coal: Business as Usual 86
- Saving Genesis? 87
- Gloucester Fats a Calf 87

TENNESSEE: WHERE COWARDS RULE. By Joseph Wood Krutch .. 88
CLOTHES. By Steven T. Byington 89
UNCLE SAM'S SWEATSHOP. By Raymond Clapper 91
BRITAIN'S LABOR WOMEN. By Crystal Eastman 92
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 94
CORRESPONDENCE 95
BOOKS:
- Your Portrait. By Leon Herald 96
- Society and Scientific Method. By Rexford Guy Tugwell 96
- Abraham Walkowitz. By Glen Mullin 97
- The Ethics of Naturalization. By Charles A. Bennett 97
- The Liberal Jew. By Johan J. Smertenko 98
- Musical Brevities. By Pitts Sanborn 99
- Books in Brief 99

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
- The Serbo-Croat Dispute. By Hamilton Fish Armstrong 101

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

LEWIS S. GANNETT

ARTHUR WARNER JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Managing Editor FREDA KIRCHWEY

Literary Editor MARK VAN DOREN

Contributing Editors

JOHN A. HOBSON LUDWIG LEWISOHN H. L. MENCKEN

NORMAN THOMAS CARL VAN DOREN

DAVID BOEHM, Advertising Manager

Subscription Rates: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 38 So. Dearborn Street. British Agent of Subscriptions and Advertising: E. Thurtle, M.P., 36, Temple Fortune Hill, N.W. 11, England.

DEFENSE DAY (which would better be called Offense Day because of its insistence upon armies and armament as a means of obtaining national security) fell even flatter this year than last. The War Department was disappointed last autumn because even its own enumerators were able to report only 17,000,000 persons as taking any part in the mobilization program. What must its grief be in having to announce that this year the number was 8,000,000—not half that of a year ago? We do not share that grief. We should rejoice to see Defense Day sunk without trace, and at present progress it soon will be. Last year there was widespread and justifiable objection to picking out a working day and devoting it to mobilization. This year the attempt to graft Defense Day to the Fourth of July provoked less opposition, but that—as events proved—was because it was so easy to ignore the War Department's program. And ignore it the public did. If they had not read about it in the daily press, which always places "patriotism" before news value in treating such events, most people would have been unaware of any attempt at Defense Day. Virtually the only persons who went through any of the official rigmarole were those who had to because of their connection with various military or "patriotic" organizations. Other Americans mercifully put behind them thoughts of armies and their senseless human sacrifice to celebrate the day with the usual picnics and outdoor sports, firecrackers and skyrockets, unmindful of and unresponsive to the war mongers' wishes to have them sign up as cannon-fodder.

WE ARE GLAD to note, also, that the organizers of Defense Day received markedly little encouragement from President Coolidge in his anniversary address under the "Washington Elm" at Cambridge, Massachusetts. It will be recalled that the War Department originally planned to kidnap Decoration Day for its mobilization but the President put his foot down on the scheme. This indicated clearly enough the President's disbelief in the peaceful character of Defense Day, and Washington gossip at the time had it that Mr. Coolidge was lukewarm toward the entire demonstration. His address in Cambridge more than bore this out. It contained not a word of approval for the advocates of "preparedness." On the contrary, the President expressed a wide and complete distrust of force in international relations when he said:

> I want to see America assume a leadership among the nations in the reliance upon the good faith of mankind. I do not see how civilization can expect permanent progress on any other theory. . . .
>
> The world has tried war with force and has utterly failed. The only hope of success lies in peace with justice.

THE GAUNT OLD WRECK of the "Washington Elm" tumbled down two years ago, and its dead branches were promptly and profitably carved into curios. Now Samuel F. Batchelder appears, in the Cambridge *Tribune*, insisting that the old tree on Cambridge Common had no right to be a patriotic shrine for half a century. Mr. Coolidge's speech was good but the occasion was poor. A stone tablet erected by the City of Cambridge in 1864 states that "Under this tree Washington first took command of the American Army, July 3, 1775," and countless schoolbooks have since pictured the stern general on horseback under the elm watching uniformed troops parade past. Mr. Batchelder ruthlessly points out that Washington had to order his ragged officers to wear ribbons to distinguish themselves from their equally ragged privates; he proudly doubts whether the father of his country would have sought the shade, "like a schoolgirl preserving her complexion"; he recalls that the New Englanders used to march single file like the Indians in fighting whom they had learned their tactics; he notes the utter absence of any contemporary record of a parade or ceremonial transfer of arms; he digs up the fact that Washington had already taken over the command and drawn up orders before the day on which the historic ceremony is supposed to have occurred. Finally, relenting most unhistorically, he imagines that Washington may possibly have passed the elm when entering Cambridge and have first shaken hands with his predecessor—afoot—under its shade. Otherwise he consigns the story to the limbo where dwell the cherry-tree and the childhood ax, the dollar that was never hurled across the Potomac, and the famous twenty-two foot jump apocryphally credited to young George.

IN WASHINGTON Secretary Kellogg suggests an international conference to discuss the abolition of extraterritoriality and other humiliating conditions imposed by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the West upon China. In Shanghai American marines are barracked in the university building from which the striking students have been expelled. More than half the warships that frown upon Shanghai are said to be American. Perhaps Mr. Kellogg's right hand and his left hand are not on speaking terms, but we hope that he will find a way to make one obey the other. The Shanghai policy is probably that which pleases most of the scared local business men; it may be the policy of a nervous consul, irritated by the defection of his household servants. But the Washington policy is plainly the policy of long-range statesmanship, and fortunately the larger business interests are aware of that. Thus far the British Foreign Office appears to be utterly blind. The reports indicate that it thinks the time "not ripe," that China must "reform" first, that apologies are required, and so on ad infinitum. Meanwhile the policy of provocation continues. The Hongkong police have orders to deport all unemployed Chinese—which comes close to enforcing industrial slavery; and the imported Sikh police still point their guns at the inflamed Chinese. Until the Western powers consent to abandon their special privileges and unequal treaty rights they will only store up dynamite to blast themselves.

FOUR MORE "FRIENDLY" TRIBES have turned against the French in Morocco. Yet France has money and reserves of ammunition and man-power with which Abd-el-Krim cannot compete, and these may, especially if she can win Anglo-Spanish support for an effective blockade, win her the ultimate victory. For the present she is alone; Spain, defeated by Abd-el-Krim, naturally has no desire to see France do better; and England has always been profoundly jealous of anything which might set a strong Power in control of the African shore opposite Gibraltar. But already the Nationalist effervescence has led to rioting in the international zone at Tangier; and ultimately, of course, the interests of all the colonial Powers are one. Abd-el-Krim won inspiration from the Turkish successes, and in turn he gives inspiration to Nationalists in Egypt, India, and even far-off China. For France the empire is at stake. If Abd-el-Krim succeeds in asserting Berber independence in the mountains north of Fez no part of Morocco will be safe. The Arab tribes now "loyal" will seek to return to their ancient isolation. Even Algeria will be suspect, and the desert route that was to knit trans-Mediterranean France together will become a forgotten dream. Why should the Algerians and Senegalese, whom France is using today to fight Moroccans, continue loyal to a European Power? And why should French boys (there is talk already of calling new classes to the colors) die in the desert fighting the desert's own sons?

BELGIUM, after seventy-three days of groping, has finally found a Government which is able to command a parliamentary majority. The new Government marks a break from party traditions of forty years' standing. The elections of April 5 gave Belgium 78 Catholic, 78 Socialist, and 23 Liberal members of Parliament, but all the parties were tired of coalitions. The King asked the Socialist leader, M. Vandervelde, to form a coalition Cabinet; he could not win support from the other parties. Then the King called on M. de Brocqueville, the Conservative; then on M. Max, the Liberal. M. Van de Vyvere next took a hand, trying to form a minority Conservative Cabinet—Parliament voted it down. Finally the King turned to M. Poullet, leader of the Catholic Radicals, and the new alignment began to form. Catholics and Socialists have joined hands. The Conservative Catholics have refused to support such an alliance with their ancient enemy, but the left wing of the party, composed chiefly of ardent Flemings, insisted on working with M. Vandervelde. M. Vandervelde, who becomes Foreign Minister, was an opponent of the Ruhr adventure but supported the French alliance, so no great change in foreign policy seems likely.

THE BOASTS OF ECONOMY of President Coolidge and the Republican Administration in Washington received a knockout blow from Governor Smith of New York at the conference of State governors in Poland Springs, Maine. In answer to a speech by H. M. Lord, Director of the Budget, who made large claims of retrenchment and economy, Governor Smith pointed out that whereas the federal government had collected $652,000,000 in taxes and customs in 1914 it had taken $3,339,000,000 in 1924, an increase of 398 per cent. In the same period, Governor Smith said, the taxes of New York State had increased only 190 per cent. Federal taxes in 1924 were $2,382,000,000 less than in the peak year of 1920, he continued, but this represented nothing more than the reduction of the government from a war basis to a peace footing. Furthermore, appropriations for the Executive Department (the President and Vice-President), which were $222,000 in the last year of the Wilson Administration, were increased to $426,000 in 1924 under the frugal Calvin Coolidge! Governor Smith might have made his criticism even stronger by reminding his hearers that the cost of living dropped 20 per cent between June, 1920, and December, 1924 (the government's own figures), and to this extent the lower federal expenditures as between those years represented a nominal rather than a real saving.

MR. DOHENY naturally felt dissatisfied when one United States court ruled against his Elk Hills oil leases and another ruled in favor of Harry Sinclair's hold on Teapot Dome. So he cast about for means of setting public opinion straight; and shortly the New York *Times* "received information" that Mr. Doheny might consent to make a statement in advance of court action. It sent a reporter to the Pacific Coast, and there the reporter spent glorious days with Mr. Doheny and his attorneys. The *Times* was in a generous mood. The great paper which thought the Washington disclosures unimportant gave thirteen full-length columns to Mr. Doheny's thoughts and meditations. One learned that Mr. Doheny had developed the Elk Hills field out of pure patriotism. Gone was the thought, which he once let slip on the witness-stand, that he might make $100,000,000 out of the lease; and utterly missing from the story—at his lawyers' behest—was the little black satchel in which he sent $100,000 to his old pal, Albert Fall. The entire Cabinet, he said, had sanctioned the leases—as to that either Mr. Doheny is in error or Messrs. Hughes and Coolidge fibbed. Naval officers begged him to get out the oil and save America. War threatened, and we were in a parlous state. As the *World* promptly noted, the Washington-conference treaties were signed before the leases, and the brashest naval officer could no longer breathe fire. The whole story is simply tosh—the most interesting thing about it is the enthusiasm of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Times to give Mr. Doheny thirteen columns of free advertising. If its passion for oil news has not been exhausted we should like to see it get the stories of the three big oil men who were abroad "on business" when the Government wanted their testimony in the Sinclair Teapot-Dome case.

WITH FEW EXCEPTIONS conservative organizations in the United States have avoided taking a position on the question of birth control. The League of Women Voters and even the National Woman's Party have steadily refused to accept the question as a legitimate part of their programs. The National Federation of Women's Clubs did pass a favorable resolution some years ago—somewhat to its own surprise, we suspect—but neither it nor any of its State branches has, so far as we know, made a serious study of the problem or backed any active effort to free birth-control information from the clutches of the obscenity laws. It is interesting, then, to find the question discussed with openness and given a measure of guarded approval in a recent pamphlet, "Marriage and Parenthood," issued by a group of members of the Society of Friends in England. With many a word of caution and much doubt of the general value of artificial methods, this group assents to the necessity of limiting the birth of children by other means than total abstinence from sex relations. The Bishop of Birmingham has openly indorsed birth control; recent labor congresses have given their support, and a cautious, limited approval has come from the National Council of Public Morals. Even conservative opinion is aroused in a country where overcrowding and underemployment are pressing political issues.

ANOTHER BOOK is being proceeded against. When Maxwell Bodenheim's novel, "Replenishing Jessica," comes up for trial this month in New York, the publisher, Mr. Liveright, will maintain that the author is distinguished and that the work itself is not only "of literary significance" but "highly moral." May his arguments win; but it would be refreshing to see a book defended in court on the mere ground that it was a book. Milton would have done no more—imagine him lugging literary standards before a grand jury! Nor would John Stuart Mill have supposed that the opinion of a few random persons on a particular day could decide the moral worth of a piece of writing. The chief moral question involved is whether law may murder literature—good or bad; and the current answer seems to be that the law may take it if a jury thinks it bad.

THE SELECTION of Professor Allen Johnson of Yale to edit the "Dictionary of American Biography" is among the best that could have been made. Professor Johnson, himself a biographer of Stephen A. Douglas, has been Larned Professor of American History at Yale since 1910, and he is best known, perhaps, through his editorship of the Yale series of fifty monographs called "Chronicles of America." He did all that an editor can do to make a series brilliant; furthermore, he acquired a first-hand knowledge of specialists over the country which will be invaluable in the new enterprise. He takes up his duties in Washington next February at an age—fifty-five—when he will be best equipped with both the experience and the energy necessary for the ten years of labor supposed now by the Committee of Management to be sufficient for the "Dictionary." It is hoped that the scholars of America will be quick to place their services at his disposal.

OF THE MILLIONS who read the Hearst newspapers we should like to know how many found in the New York *Evening Journal* the other day an editorial on reading. The title was What Is Man's Duty? and the tone was earnest in the way that most exhorters of the populace to improve itself are earnest. It is man's duty, said the *Journal,* to feed his mind—to read for at least half an hour each day and to think about what is read. Cross-word puzzles will not do; only good books will equip one for the inevitable query: "How much will you amount to mentally twenty years from now?" All this was crude if true. But there followed a list of books which no crude writer had chosen: "Macbeth," "Hamlet," "King Lear," "The Tempest," James's "Psychology," Montaigne's "Essays," Buckle's "History of Civilization," Guizot's "Civilization in France," Montesquieu's "Spirit of the Laws," Wells's "Outline of History," and any three good simple volumes on astronomy, geology, and evolution. It is agreeable to guess what a whole nation of Hearst readers, if it existed and took all the advice given it, would do to Mr. Bryan.

Oh how I love humanity,
With love so pure and pringlish;
And how I hate the horrid French
Who never will be English.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISHMEN AND FRENCHMEN will continue to excite poetry and polemics as long as the two nations are neighbors. An example of these differences of method and motive has been pointed out by a correspondent of the London *Nation.* In carrying out the death penalty the English acquaint the prisoner with the time of his execution beforehand, awake him early on the last morning, and serve him a breakfast of ham and eggs. The argument is that several days of "fearful certitude is allotted so that the doomed man may make his peace with his Maker." To the Frenchman this is "unimaginative and unfeeling harshness of mentality." The French give the condemned man hope until half an hour before the end, and during that half hour he is offered a priest, rum, and a cigarette. The Anglo-Saxon does his best to improve man. This worries the Frenchman hardly at all; he wishes rather to make life more agreeable.

JUDGE PICTURES a bit of water covered with colliding craft, bordered with tiers of bathers, and fringed with cottages, pavilions, and a triple row of parked motors. The title of the picture is "Present condition of the little lake that you discovered four years ago, when it was almost unknown." Every summer week-end sees executives in golf-suits hastening away from their offices after lunch on Friday, and proletarians departing at daybreak on Sunday, sandwiches wrapped in bathing-suit, in search of solitude and coolness. But solitude, when it is shared with a million or so, ceases to be solitude. Country which in the winter is deer-haunted wilderness becomes in summer a lunch-strewn park. At best the holiday ends with a slow return in a long line of motor-cars. A writer in the New York *World* offers an inspired solution, combining seclusion with rest and relief from the heat of the city. His method is to spend the week-end in his bath-room, immersed in a tub of cold water, reading a book.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coal: Business as Usual

COAL is the core of contemporary civilization. And a pretty rotten core it is. No going industry is without its peculiar lesions, fevers, blisters, and biles. Coal has them all, with locomotor ataxia thrown in. Whether this be due to the ancient hold of laissez faire on the grandpapa of all machinery we must leave to the professors of economic history. As Mr. Lesher of the *Coal Age* puts it, the bituminous industry is as unorganized as the retail-grocery business. It bows to no trust, it bows to no state; proudly it stands, bathed in the winds of free competition—about as efficient, about as serviceable, as a number-one earthquake.

And why should it not? There are three mines opened for every two the country needs. There are three miners digging (from time to time) where two would suffice. When demand is brisk the "snow-bird mines" begin to open; and when demand expires we have that many more mines—each, be it observed, with its complement of miners, shafts, tipples, pumps—all, save the miners, bearing their full complement of interest, insurance, depreciation, repairs, and overhead burden. The Central Pennsylvania fields, according to Floyd Parsons of the *Gas Age Record*, have five hundred separate and distinct operations producing 60,000,000 tons a year, when "in the interest of efficiency not over ten or fifteen companies should be operating in large units." Soft-coal mines are equipped to dig 18,000,000 tons a week, while all the railroads can move, with every coal-car loaded, is 12,000,000 tons. For thirty years the men who dig in mines have averaged 93 working days idle in a 300-day year. In a year of business depression like 1893 or 1921 they are out of the pits for 140 days.

And so, over-built, over-manned, over-burdened, and utterly uncoordinated, this crazy relic of competitive economics staggers from one debacle to the next, amid the yells and the curses of miners, operators, and consuming public alike. The present crisis was expected; it was as inevitable as the tides of the ocean. You cannot have your cake and eat it too. You cannot get an industry all set to dig 800,000,000 tons of coal when only 500,000,000 are needed, and suppose that anything but recurring crises will be the order of the day. Coal inflates and flops with the business cycle, but in addition it goes on the loose according to a private time-table of its own.

While overdevelopment is the principal distemper the carcass is rank with certain other grave disorders—an appalling accident rate, bad underground management, batteries of stone-age beehive coke ovens, failure to utilize by-products, unlimited cross-hauling—"coal cars moving in and out of Chicago like dice in a gambling game as the spot market dictates," failure to develop power at the pit mouth, skimming the cream from the best beds and thus rendering hundreds of millions of tons forever unreclaimable.

For the miners, the order of the day is chronic unemployment, evil conditions underground, with the chance of wholesale entombment always immediately ahead. For the operators business as usual includes uncertain markets, negative margins, high operating costs, and a staggering burden of overhead expenses. These circumstances do not militate to improve the temper of either of the parties. As a result they have achieved a mastery of mutual vituperation which would bring even a captain of marines to the salute.

How the union has ever held together at all with this vast excess of men over jobs is a mystery. Non-unionism cannot fail to be a perpetual and impending menace. After all, a man must eat, and a hungry baby makes no distinction between the pay roll of a union or a non-union operator. Probably nine-tenths of the energy of the United Mine Workers has gone into trying to hold the ranks of an industry which by every known psychological and engineering law is incapable of closed ranks.

And there we are. But there, if we wish, we do not always have to be. The problem of coordinating coal, vast as it is, is not a problem beyond human capacity. The Fuel Administration in the war came near to solving it within two years. It is a matter of correlating production with consumers' requirements. The Fuel Administration determined requirements for every section of the country and then proceeded to dig coal—*from the nearest mine*—to meet these requirements. It provided an assured market for the selected mines, kept the miners steadily at work, eliminated the untold cross-hauling. Soft coal, until the problem of storage is solved, can never be made an industry without some seasonal variation; but organized intelligence has already pointed the way to the elimination of an enormous amount of the usual hysterical procedure. The thing has been done. Nor does this necessarily call for federal control. A trust might do it—oil after it reaches the pipe line is infinitely better behaved than coal. An operators' association might do it. The miners might force its adoption, and contribute to its administration through some plan of joint control.

Back in 1922 John Brophy of the union's district No. 2 laid the foundation for such a plan. He started to educate miners in the technology and economics of their industry. Through a pamphlet series he broadcasted the staggering wastes, the monumental absurdities, of the present structure. But he was a voice crying in the wilderness. Those grim-jawed men who had the keeping of 600,000 miners in hand preferred the American tradition. They were upstanding, two-fisted fighters. They could call an operator more lurid names in one convention speech than were ever before dreamed of. They could discomfort "scabs" with an unprecedented artistry. And, when times were slack, they could start a row among themselves. As for an operator considering his mine as an integral part of the industry upon which modern civilization is built—instead of as a grab-bag—the notion is almost unthinkable.

We doubt if the physical layout of bituminous coal is such as to make it readily susceptible to holding-company finance. A coal trust in the sense that anthracite is trustified—probably to the advantage of all concerned—is remote. We doubt if the cranial capacity of the average operator will permit of intelligent control through an operators' association. Which leaves the miners as probably the prime movers if anything is to be done. But to date the virile leadership of the miners has preferred brawn to brains, and we can confidently expect recurrent locomotor ataxia until John Brophy's blazed trail becomes a broad highway.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Troy O. Free Public School Library Class Book

Saving Genesis?

JOHN SCOPES'S sister has lost her job. The board of education of Paducah, Kentucky, will not let her continue to teach mathematics—because she refuses to affirm disbelief in evolution.

Within the last century the Scotch church barred from its ranks members who used fanning-mills for winnowing their grain. The leaders of the church held that the practice was contrary to the text "The wind bloweth where it listeth." Three-quarters of a century ago, when doctors first began the merciful use of anesthetics in obstetrical cases, churchmen arose, text in hand, to insist that the pains of childbirth must not be mitigated. To use chloroform, some of the parsons held, was to avoid the primeval curse on woman. Dr. Simpson won his battle for chloroform in Scotland only when he recalled Genesis II, 21. "That," said he, "is the record of the first surgical operation ever performed, and that text proves that the Maker of the universe, before he took the rib from Adam's side for the creation of Eve, caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam."

For centuries the church—when church and state worked hand in hand—thundered against any man who dared think or say that the earth was round. The bishop of Ceuta and the theologians of Salamanca overwhelmed Columbus with quotations from the Psalms, from St. Paul and St. Augustine. When Copernicus made his great discovery of the revolution of the earth about the sun, Martin Luther and Melanchthon vied with the Catholic dignitaries in abusing the "upstart astrologer." Did not Ecclesiastes say that "the earth standeth fast forever"? When Galileo's rude telescope revealed the moons of Jupiter, confirming Copernicus's observations, he was told that his pretended discovery "vitiated the whole Christian plan of salvation." One learned priest argued that if there were other planets they must be inhabited, since God made nothing in vain; but those inhabitants could not be descended from Adam; therefore they and their planets could not exist. Poor Galileo, after publishing his letters on the sun spots, was ordered to "abandon entirely the opinion that the sun is the center of the universe, and that the earth moves, and to abstain from sustaining, teaching, or defending that opinion in any manner whatever, orally or by writing"—an order worthy of the Tennessee Legislature which passed the anti-evolution bill three hundred and nine years later. Galileo was forced to make the declaration:

> I, Galileo, being a prisoner and on my knees, and before your eminences, having before my eyes the Holy Gospel, which I touch with my hands, abjure, detest, and curse the error and the heresy of the movement of the earth.

But the earth has continued spinning on its axis despite all the instructions of the ecclesiastics; and, while it turned its face diurnally to and from the sun, science, too, has gone marching on. Today no legislature would prohibit teaching contrary to the first chapter of Ecclesiastes, although Tennessee still seeks by legislation to preserve the first chapter of Genesis. The lesson of the centuries is plain to all the world if not to Tennessee and the school board of Paducah, Kentucky. Churchmen have hampered but never halted the progress of scientific truth; and whenever pious men have sought to protect their puny interpretations of the universe by legislation and proscription they have hurt only their churches and their creeds.

Gloucester Fats a Calf

AROUND a sheltering bay in that great promontory of granite northeast of Boston known as Cape Ann lies the ancient fishing town of Gloucester, the G. H. Q. of the salt-cod industry of America. Along its wharves are row upon row of racks upon which cod—split, cleaned, and salted—lie whitening and curing. Made fast to the piers or tugging at anchor in the harbor are the staunch and saucy schooners which pursue the cod into the tumultuous Atlantic, riding out the fiercest of storms on Georges, Quereau, or the Grand Banks—except when one of them is hove down with all hands, or sliced in two in a fog by the carving-knife prow of an onrushing liner, as happened recently when the Tuscania hit the Rex, sending fifteen of her crew of twenty-four to the bottom.

Gloucester lives off the dangerous trade of the deep-sea fisherman and it does not take life lightly. It is as sober and austere as the granite of the cape all about it. Hence we were not a little surprised to read an article with a Gloucester date line in the Boston *Globe*, beginning:

> See the conquering bootlegger comes!
> Sound the timbrel; beat the drums!

It seems that four of Gloucester's young men were last year convicted of rum-running and sent to Atlanta penitentiary for a spell. When they were let out and started for home the other day, circulars were scattered about the old town, signed "Gloucester's Committee on Absent Sons," announcing that the wandering boys would be welcomed at the railway station with a brass band, and calling upon the citizenry in general to turn out and make the occasion memorable. At first the announcement was regarded as a joke; but when it was learned that a former employer of one of the young men had obtained a permit for a parade, the pillars of the town—pillars of stone, you may believe—took alarm. The Municipal Council was hastily convened, but the City Solicitor advised that there was no law by which the parade could be prevented. And granite Gloucester is law-abiding—even when it hurts. Then a delegation from the Chamber of Commerce appealed to the State Police to send a detachment to prevent the demonstration, but the head of that organization declined to burn his fingers. Thereupon moral suasion was attempted. A committee pleaded with the man with the permit; he finally agreed to call off the parade but held firm for the band concert. The bandsmen were asked not to turn out, but they stood by their agreement. So the welcome took place, although it was probably less imposing than one might gather from the Boston *Globe*. With its usual enterprise *The Nation* has obtained an account (which will not be syndicated) from its own special, exclusive correspondent on the spot. Our own special, exclusive correspondent writes:

> There were at least three hundred people at the station to meet the boys, but fully two hundred and seventy-five of them were curiosity seekers like me, my wife, and our cook.
>
> Gloucester is so dry at present that a man with snake bite might as well jump off the dock and finish the job.
>
> The returned runners, popular lads, including a former policeman and the brother of a famous ball player, apparently were whisked away from the station without a chance to respond to the greeting. In the confusion Milt Butler, the well-known and popular trombonist, suffered a painful injury when a Ford ran over his left foot.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tennessee: Where Cowards Rule

By JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Dayton, Tennessee, July 5

EVEN those who do not happen, like the present writer, to have been born and bred in Tennessee should not find it difficult to forgive Dayton. A tiny town set in the midst of fruitful strawberry fields, it had never heard of any Darwin except the one who keeps the local dry-goods store until Mr. Bryan enlightened it, and to this day it is ignorant of that famous meeting of the British Association when Huxley and Wilberforce threshed out the question which has now arisen, some sixty years later, to puzzle it. Its faith is no narrower than that of every other community equally remote; its temper is better than was the temper of Oxford half a century ago; and if some of its inhabitants turn to the law to protect their children against the teaching of a dangerous theory, it is with a simplicity of mind which has no conception of the questions of academic freedom involved.

Dayton, moreover, once the law was passed, was ready and anxious to deal as best it could with all the questions, legal and scientific, involved. While the president of the State University sat in his office praying that he might be allowed to violate the law in peace; while he was quietly issuing (as several members of his faculty have assured me he was) unofficial instructions to his teaching staff that they should make no changes in their instruction; and while he was, at the same time, seeking to retain the friendship of both sides and accepting the congratulations of various fundamentalist bodies for his stand against evolution, Dayton was arranging to settle in simple honesty what the representatives of science, education, and enlightenment were anxious only to dodge.

And so when I sit at the little table in Robinson's drug-store where the argument began and discuss with the county superintendent of schools his attitude as one of the prosecution, I feel that the shame of Tennessee is not in Dayton. There is no State of the Union, no country of the world, which does not have communities as simple-minded as this one, and if Tennessee has become the laughing-stock of the world it is not because she has her villages which are intellectually a half century behind the centers of world thought but rather because among her sons who know better there is scarcely one who has the courage to stand up for what he thinks and knows instead of flying quickly to cover lest he might have to sacrifice to his convictions some political advantage or some material gain.

At Dayton no one is afraid to tell me what he thinks. But when I go to Knoxville, seat of the State University and one of the three largest cities in Tennessee, I enter a different world. One of the most important members of the university board of trustees takes me aside to whisper in my ear; the president of that institution, telling me I am a good fellow, takes me confidentially by the arm; the editor of one of the leading newspapers, distinguished by the safe piety of its editorials upon the subject, closes the door of his office; and the remarks of all might be summarized in what were the actual words of one: "Of course it's a damn-fool law—but I won't be quoted." These and other Knoxvillians are defensive and indignant; they resent in various terms the publicity they have attracted and they protest against being judged by the laws their legislature passes; but these Knoxvillians will not admit that, fundamentally, they are to blame. In Tennessee bigotry is militant and sincere; intelligence is timid and hypocritical, and in that fact lies the explanation of the sorry role which she is playing in contemporary history. Dayton's only crime is the naive belief that a law may be intended to be enforced.

Not even those who voted for the bill wanted it to pass. As a member of the legislature told me, he thought he might as well win the favor of a few fundamentalist constituents by saying "aye" because he felt sure the Senate would reject so preposterous a measure; the Senate, following the same admirable political logic, decided to put the burden upon the Governor, who, as the last responsible party, would hardly dare write himself down an ass; but the Governor, so it is said, remarked only: "They've got their nerve to pass the buck to me when they know I want to be United States Senator" before he signed the bill. And strangest of all, even the politicians make no particular effort to conceal their dishonesty because they feel that while the fundamentalist will be satisfied with any obedience however venal, the rest of the population will acquiesce in any amount of political corruption and cowardice. Thus the Governor, who had accompanied his signature with a letter stating, in effect, that no one expected that the law would be enforced, became an earnest supporter of the bill when the letters from the Epworth League and the Baptist Young People's Association began to arrive; and Senator Graves, who has distinguished himself by the firmness of his utterances in favor of the same bill, amazed me by giving me permission to quote him as saying that though he very much regretted that the bill had been passed I would have understood why he voted for it had I been in the Chamber to hear the cheers and jeers of the fanatics who had caused it to be introduced. "I am no politician," he added cryptically, "but if I were one I should have had to vote for that bill whether I wanted to or not."

Meanwhile the law is accepted by the people of the State in a manner worthy of the legislators whom it elected to represent it. The average business man is puzzled by the furor created in the outside world; he cannot understand why anyone should care whether evolution is taught in the schools or not when obviously neither business nor industry is affected by questions so highly abstract. The president of the university, who ought to know better, can think of no plan more courageous than weakly to disobey the law when necessary, while pretending to the legislature that he approves of its acts or, more accurately, gives it to understand that he will not embarrass it by publicly stating his opinion of the law which both he and it know to be asinine. Concerned above all else with his precious appropriations, it never occurs to him to ask whether his chief duty might not possibly be something other than wangling money from a cowardly legislature. He does not realize

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that this first duty might be to prove himself worthy to spend the educational funds he is so eager to get, to show some sign of that zeal for truth and that intellectual honesty which it is, presumably, the function of education to inculcate, and he is anxious only to defend himself to everybody. No real scientist, he assures me, ever offended anybody, only pseudo-scientists do that; and when I mention the name of Huxley, who once met the question which is disturbing him, he cuts me off before I can bring in the names of Galileo and the rest.

As for the faculty which serves under this unhappy president, it is by no means comfortable. Not every member follows willingly its leader and, as one confessed to me, some are a little concerned over what their colleagues in more honest universities think of them, but seven professors were recently summarily dismissed, and so the others are drawn into the vicious circle of fear which includes nearly every public or semi-public man in the State. The legislator is afraid of some fundamentalist hid in the mountains; the president is afraid of the legislature; the faculty is afraid of the president; and the newspaper editor who "leads public opinion" is afraid of someone who is afraid of someone who is afraid of someone else. Nobody knows how strong the party which honestly desires the anti-evolution bill really is, and as long as the present circle is not broken nobody ever will. Here and there one can find a man who honestly believes as some (but by no means all) of the inhabitants of Dayton believe, but nine times out of ten when one thinks one has one's hand upon an honest bigot he turns out to be holding his opinion chiefly in deference to somebody else, and thus the party grows. Every time one man turns fundamentalist out of fear of a second, a third turns fundamentalist out of fear of him.

Tennessee has no idea how this vicious circle may be broken. From her experience with prohibition she has learned that it is much easier to violate a law than it is to oppose it, and she was proposing quietly to apply this useful lesson to the anti-evolution law when along came Dayton to disturb her contented anarchy and to make her a national spectacle, bewildered and indignant, face to face with the laws which she had allowed to be written upon the statute-books.

To mere lawlessness Tennessee had become completely reconciled. When, for example, her highly moral legislature came as a committee of the whole to pay an official visit to the university just after the anti-evolution bill was passed, and when that committee behaved in a generally disgraceful fashion, Tennessee was not particularly disturbed. Though a group of faculty ladies who accompanied them on a sight-seeing trip to the mountains were, as one of them told me, embarrassed by the multiplicity of flasks which were urged upon them, and though, as I have the sworn statement of an eyewitness to assure me, another legislator, reeling about the country club, expressed his intention to vote against the appropriation because "they told me the trip wouldn't cost me a cent and the first day I got here I lost seventy-five dollars shooting craps," these matters were not considered worth even mention by any of the three newspapers, in spite of the fact that the conduct of the legislators was common knowledge. Such is the inevitable result of hypocritical lawlessness, and Tennessee has learned how to swallow it. Now, however, the affair of Dayton has arisen to remind the inhabitants that they may be called upon either to obey the thousand and one moral laws which the legislature is ready to enact or to break the vicious circle which makes them possible; and these inhabitants do not know how to escape the dilemma.

Tennessee does not want to do the first of these things. Tennessee, because she lacks courage, does not know how to do the second. Tennessee is *very* unhappy.

Clothes

By STEVEN T. BYINGTON

WHEN Katharine B. Davis was Commissioner of Correction of New York she said something in a public address in favor of less regulation. A man in the audience put the traditionally unanswerable question: "Would you allow a man to run in the street naked?" Miss Davis replied that for her part she could see nothing objectionable in anybody's showing a nice clean skin. The questioner was silenced; I presume he was breathless.

This was a sign of the times. Both she and he could surely remember the day when the foremost civilized nations agreed that covering the skin of most of the body and disguising the principal contours of the person for at least one sex were absolutely essential to morality, that the sight of that skin or those contours had an invincible tendency to stir sexual impulses in a person of the opposite sex, and hence that their exhibition was a tort against the beholder, into whose mind it forced such feelings as he was unwilling to harbor, or ought to be unwilling. The more sophisticated, indeed, while they held most strictly to this code for the ordinary business of life, maintained an exception in the case of costumes which were worn not for work but when one's only occupation was to be gazed at, as on the stage or in the evening dress of high society; but the absurdity of this special exception was always obvious to the great majority of the nation. Finally, it was held to be clear that the wearing of more or less clothing by almost all nations was the evidence of an unerring instinct divinely implanted in man.

In these later days the science of comparative morality has been teaching us that the wearing of clothing not needed for comfort, and particularly the special attention to covering certain parts of the body, is not due to an instinct of modesty or to a wish to hold sexual impulses in check, but is, on the contrary, originally a method for stimulating those impulses and for calling attention to those parts.

At the same time the increasing facility of travel and the evidence of the motion picture have made more widely familiar the fact that the sight of bare skin, even to the utmost, is not sexually provocative when you are used to it. The case of missionaries is especially worth notice. In countries to which clothing is new it is more or less the flag of Christianity, and when any missionary comes in sight of a village and sees a clothed crowd he is bound

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to rejoice at this evidence that the place has accepted Christianity; this cannot but tend strongly to bias him in favor of clothing. Nevertheless in our day we have such broad-minded missionaries as Thomas Chalmers, recognized as the foremost hero and wisest counselor of missions to the Pacific islands in recent times, who formally reported that in his opinion it was not advisable to tell converts to wear clothing above the waist-line; and Ashe, who in his "Two Kings of Uganda," after telling how he bought from a Kavirondo woman the one superlatively scanty garment which she had on, adds (obviously because somebody in England had taken him to task for it) that this was no immodesty, since total nudity for women is ordinary in Kavirondo and there were several women standing by who were wearing nothing.

Meanwhile our own practice, if it has not gone so far, is tending in the same direction. The increasing demand for outdoor recreation insists on more and more opportunity for unimpeded movements. Medical science is proclaiming that sunlight on the skin—sunlight which has not passed through glass, is the latest specification—is a most valuable tonic to the whole system, especially that it is the foremost preventive and cure of tuberculosis and rickets. Even fashion's see-saw tends to become an intermittent forward movement when there are so many who eagerly take advantage of every change in one direction and doggedly resist every change in the other. No wonder, in the presence of all this, that conservative moralists are now fighting for the retention of garments that conservative moralists have in the past always wanted to abolish—I mean corsets.

Is the change for good or evil? If for good, has it gone far enough?

On the score of health, medical science replies with substantial unanimity that although a person accustomed to clothing should not leave it off too suddenly, yet the disuse of clothing when it is not required for physical protection is altogether good, and the further it is carried the better. There are those who cry out that fair-skinned persons can have too much light; but their arguments do not get a detailed sifting (which they badly need) because the general experience of the hygienic benefit of a tanned skin is felt to close the question. And which way comfort inclines on a hot day is as obvious as which way economy inclines. Neither can there be any doubt as to the interests of beauty. If Solomon in all his glory was less beautiful than a stalk of lilies, it was because the lilies showed the beauty God had given them, while Solomon covered his up.

So health, comfort, economy, beauty give an unimpeachable verdict in favor of a release from clothing. The one point of serious dispute is the moral issue. On this, too, we may take it as settled that partial or complete nudity is no moral injury to people who are used to it. The assertion made in the "Britannica" and in many works of first-class standing, that naked peoples are as a rule more moral than clothed peoples, may have been made on inadequate foundations; but it is at least interesting to see how many different races are cited as evidence of it. At least the facts show that such immorality as exists in any naked nation must be due to causes which are common to the clothed and the naked; no one can make out that it is caused even partly by nudity.

And the alleged instinct of mankind does not exist, at least as regards the view that nudity is an outrage on public morality. Primitive peoples who have a feeling for clothing always take the view that it is not a matter of morality but of self-respect, that exposure of the person is an injury not to the spectators but to the person exposed; hence public exposure of the person is made an element of the punishment of certain crimes, or of the disgracing of a captured enemy. So, for example, the ancient Hebrews (Bible), the ancient Germans (Tacitus), even the church law of medieval Europe (*duas vxores capienti, vel duos viros, de iure ciuili poena capitis imponitur. de iure can. vxori debent incidi uestes anteriores, & posteriores*). Clothing can be dispensed with when religion, mourning, or other causes justify a disregard of the forms of self-respect; for instance, there is no basis for the allegation that "naked" in the twentieth chapter of Isaiah means "in a tunic." Commentaries that say it has that meaning cite Gesenius's "Thesaurus" as their authority, and Gesenius cites Deyling's "Observations" as his authority, and Deyling's reasons are not worth a row of pins. Compare also the story of what Queen Michal thought of King David's religious dance.

The earliest instance I know of the modern view, that exposure of the person is an outrage on the public, is a story which Dio Cassius tells of the Emperor Augustus. Livia was out in the evening for some reason or other, and met some young men, probably tipsy, sporting naked in the street. This was not customary at Rome, and Augustus wanted to punish them; but Livia felt that to punish them would be an indignity to her self-respect, for, said she, to a chaste woman it was no more than so many statues. Livia, with the conservatism proper to her sex, represents the ancient and world-wide point of view; Augustus, the innovating statesman, the modern European idea.

Yet we need not doubt that a change in custom, like all changes in human life, must involve evils during the change. I am told that the Centennial Exposition of 1876 had a disastrous moral effect on a good many young people who had never seen nude statuary in their country towns; the statues at the Exposition stirred wicked thoughts and feelings which bore fruit in their lives at home. Today there cannot be much of the United States in which the people are unfamiliar with the nude in respectable art; and who would wish to go back to conditions in which such a sight would have such effects?

Here we touch the nub of the question. When the laws of propriety forbid as salacious any exposure beyond a certain line, an accidental glimpse of more than the accepted limit will have the effect of a salacious sight because custom labels it as such. Thus to man's natural temptations to sin we add a new and sometimes powerful artificial temptation.

If the case is not so bad as it sounds, if exposure does not produce such a salacious effect, then by the same token changing our custom is not so terrible as it sounds. Have you, conservative friend, been noticeably stirred to vicious feelings by the recent greater freedom in clothing, or are you shocked because you expect somebody else to have feelings worse than yours? Or are you afraid that those who diminish their covering are aiming to attract mates? But you have always argued that propriety was the way to attract a mate, you have said "If you don't dress modestly nobody will want to marry you." What has really

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happened is that the young people of today refuse to let the thought of catching a mate dominate all departments of their life, and they insist on the right to dress for health and comfort and let mating take its chances.

There is instruction in a youthful letter of the poet Coleridge. In 1794, on a walking trip in the southern part of Great Britain, he wrote to a college friend from a place which he describes as a fashionable watering-place of the region:

> Walking on the sea sands I was surprised to see a number of fine women bathing promiscuously with men and boys perfectly naked. Doubtless the citadels of their chastity are so impregnably strong, that they need not the ornamental bulwarks of modesty; but, seriously speaking, where sexual distinctions are least observed, men and women live together in the greatest purity. Concealment sets the imagination a-working, and as it were *cantharidizes* our desires.

This twenty-two-year-old was not accustomed to such sights, knew what sort of feelings they were expected to rouse in him, but found that in fact the sight presented itself as a curiosity, not as a provocation.

I conclude that we should defend the liberty that has been gained, and desire more liberty if attainable. What can an individual do about it?

First, look with an air of tolerant unconcern at all manifestations of the new spirit. Do not stare, or comment even in praise, nor yet make any effort to avoid looking at them. Attention is the worst thing in the world for innovations of this sort. A quarter of a century ago, when bicycling was the fashion, there was a promising move to introduce knickers as a sport costume for women; for the "bloomers" of that date were knickers in cut. The movement was killed mainly by the attention of those who liked the idea but could not keep their tongues off it. In our time knickers have come in under the shelter of more startling innovations.

Second, when the enemy will not let the innovation go unnoticed, defend it ruthlessly. Don't let the advocates of clothing talk as if they were acknowledged to be the more modest party; remind them that when one person finds exposure shameful because it suggests sexual ideas, and another finds it harmless because it has no evil suggestion, this proves that the first one's mind is fuller of sex than the second one's. If Christopher Ward attacks Sherwood Anderson by pointing out that determination to expose the person is a symptom of a type of insanity, for which see books on insanity, reply that repugnance to the sight of nudity is a symptom of a type of sexual perversion, for which see books on that subject, and that sexual perverts have a notorious proneness to propagate their perversion to such immature minds as come under their influence.

Third, when you are deciding whether to dress according to the demands of bodily comfort or according to the demands of immediate social comfort, count as one strong motive the good that you can do to others by setting an example of unconformity. Nothing but setting examples reforms custom. There is no probability that if you are too extreme you will hurt your own cause. It is truer that by being extreme you help to secure the success of those who would be counted extremists if your extremeness did not make them seem comparatively moderate; remember those knickers.

Fourth, aggressively demand that the clothing of babies shall be just what is best for their health regardless of convention, and that children of kindergarten age shall have the same liberty of costume in the less crowded city street that they have on the more crowded bathing-beach. If the doctor says the baby will be safer against rickets by having the sunshine all over his skin, then, in city or suburb or country, let him get the sunshine all over.

Fifth, remember that the common law permits not only all exposure that public opinion will at all permit (except possibly for babies) but very much more. See law-books.

Uncle Sam's Sweatshop

By RAYMOND CLAPPER

LET'S look, for a moment, at the other side of this economy business. Everyone, to be sure, wants the government operated economically. The cost of the federal government is $2,000,000,000 a year below what it was in 1921 and this is justly regarded as a remarkable achievement in pubic finance. But as Mr. Coolidge said in his address to the business organization of the government on June 22, "We are fast reaching the time when we can not look forward to appreciable reduction in the legitimate cost of government," and the question now raised is, How far shall we go with the economy program? Does the country want economy at any price?

Most persons rebel at the horrors of the sweatshop. They prefer to pay slightly more for a garment they know to have been made by decently paid and decently treated labor, and not wrung from the midnight toil of an undernourished child. Would the same persons begrudge a few cents more on their taxes every year in order that those who performed the labor of the government might be decently paid? It is hard to believe that the country wants its government to be converted into a wholesale sweatshop.

If this suggestion provokes the picture of idling government clerks wasting time with their feet propped on the desks, living a leisurely life of ease in the beautiful city of Washington, let me offer in evidence a letter which came recently to the editor of the Washington *Daily News:*

> Dear Mr. Editor of the *News:*
>
> I am one of the unfortunates who were kicked out in 1920. I am seventy-seven years of age and served Uncle Sam for forty-four years. My salary was $1,200. I was never able to save a cent.
>
> I get sixty dollars a month.* I have a daughter to care for. We have two rooms. I pay $25 a month, and have no heat. I have to buy coal—half a ton a month for $7. I had to give up my insurance.
>
> I have not bought a suit of clothes since my retirement and never expect to buy one. For our Christmas dinner we had sandwiches and coffee, three times that day.
>
> I would like to see a Senator try to live on $60 a month

* This is retirement pay provided out of a fund created by deductions from salaries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Washington or any other place in the U. S. It is a crime the way we are treated.

It was just a year ago that President Coolidge vetoed a bill to increase the pay of postal employees. Their average salaries were about $1,750 a year. Mr. Coolidge vetoed the increase because, he said, the average pay of all government clerks within the corresponding range was $1,554 a year and it was obvious that the postal clerks already were paid more than the average prevailing in other departments.

"Government extravagance must stop," he said sternly in this veto message. "The people of the nation are paying all that it is possible for them to pay. . . . I do not see how I can approve the large increase in expenditures of this kind, except on the plea of urgent necessity." This bill provided for a total increase amounting to $68,000,000 a year; later the increase was granted after Congress raised postal rates to absorb most of it.

Now let's see how the economy program was applied on another occasion, just last March. The Senate—or more accurately some dozen or fifteen Senators—had returned to the Capitol one night after dinner to dispose of routine legislation that had accumulated toward the end of the short session. The session lasted just thirty-two minutes and this is what happened:

After the District of Columbia appropriation bill had been rushed through practically without debate, the legislative appropriation bill was brought up and passed, section by section, with practically no debate. After about twenty minutes of this routine performance, an amendment was sent to the desk providing that the pay of the Vice-President, the Speaker of the House, and members of the Cabinet should be raised from $12,000 a year to $15,000, and that the pay of Senators and Representatives should be increased from $7,500 a year to $10,000. This amendment was read hurriedly and agreed to unanimously without a word of debate or a record vote, though it involved an increase of almost $1,500,000 a year to the government pay roll.

Then Senator Edge of New Jersey offered an amendment and this debate followed:

> MR. EDGE. Mr. President, the amendment refers to a laborer in the document room who has been in the employ of the Senate for twenty-odd years and is receiving the munificent salary of $1,010 a year. This amendment simply places him in the class above in which case he would receive a salary of $1,140 a year, an increase of $130. I think after twenty years' service in the document room a man is entitled to have his class advanced to the extent of $130 a year.
>
> MR. WARREN. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator is willing to withdraw his amendment?
>
> MR. EDGE. If I have the same assurance from the chairman that he will press it in the ordinary way, I will not insist on it.
>
> MR. WARREN. All I can assure the Senator is that we certainly will take it up with the House committee and give it serious consideration.

The amendment was rejected. There being no other amendments, the bill was passed without objection and the Senate adjourned. As everyone knows, the pay increase went through for the Senators and Congressmen and the Cabinet officials; but the old messenger still is waiting for his.

In vetoing the postal-pay increase Mr. Coolidge criticized the employees for the activity of their labor organization which had been working to get the bill through Congress. But not yet has one word been raised in criticism of those Congressmen and Senators who voted themselves raises, the increases alone being more than the average yearly salary of the government workers.

The question is, Where should the pressure for economy be heaviest, on the low-paid government employee who at best has little hope of promotion to a real living wage, or on the areas where greater slashes might be made, without noticeably injuring the efficiency of the government? There is the Tariff Commission. It spent many months investigating the cost of sugar production here and abroad so that the President might be guided in considering whether to reduce the tariff on Cuban importations. And after the report was in, and the President had thought it over for nearly a year, he decided that the data were so untrustworthy that he could not accept the recommendation! Is a bureau like that of any use? It costs the government perhaps $700,000 a year. What about the various "lame-duck" boards and commissions, the international boundary commissions made up of Senators and Congressmen who, being no longer appreciated by their constituents, were called back by presidential appointment into the service of their country to the extent of drawing $7,500 to $10,000 a year and making annual fishing trips through the Great Lakes? Whenever there is a real boundary question affecting the Canadian or Mexican lines, the State Department puts its international-law experts on the work, not the retired politicians on the commissions.

Private business enterprises which have been most successful over long periods are invariably those which pay their labor well and treat it well. Economies are sought at vital spots and not through sweatshop methods. In putting the government on a more business-like basis, why should this principle be overlooked?

Britain's Labor Women

By CRYSTAL EASTMAN

EIGHTEEN years ago Mary MacArthur, Margaret MacDonald, and Mary Middleton called the first Conference of Labor Women. There was no franchise for women in England then, and little prospect of any. This year a thousand delegates and visitors packed Birmingham Town Hall. Presiding over them was Ellen Wilkinson, M. P., witty and red-haired, ex-Communist, and now the only woman sitting for the British Labor Party at Westminster.

Forty of the delegates represented the Women's Cooperative Guild, the Independent Labor Party, and the Fabian Society; seventy-five represented trade unions. Seven hundred and thirty-one represented women's sections of the Labor Party from all over England, Scotland, and Wales. Nearly all were working-class housewives whose absence from home meant that friendly neighbors had to volunteer care for husband and child. The husbands of these women were Welsh miners, shipbuilders from Tyneside, shop assistants, railway conductors, cotton-mill workers, seamen, carpenters. Never have I seen a conference of American women where the same forces were gathered together. England is small. Third-class railway fares are cheaper than fares for the same distances in America. Even with the low wages and unemployment now prevalent, it had been possible to achieve a representative convention.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I walked to the platform and looked at the earnest tired faces of these women. Their plain, often shabby clothes, and their sallow complexions were evidences of the poverty that is the common lot of the English working class. Poor food and strain had done their best to remove the beauty from the faces before me; but the beauty of courage was still there.

As the meeting opened, messages of greeting were read from Sweden, Finland, and Russia. A small but significant feature to record. These women are opening their own channels of communication with the Continent, and they have begun to learn much from the determined and educated feminist groups in Scandinavia and Russia. Not only domestic problems, of food, housing, old age, and maternity, are now recognized on the agendas of women's conferences, but foreign affairs are boldly discussed. Not long ago foreign affairs were considered the preserve of highly placed men.

The uses of the convention are three. It is the occasion for direct representatives of working-class women to formulate their own program, so that with some sort of united front they can make themselves felt in the Labor Party Congress that follows later in the year. At the conference the women leaders from National Labor Party headquarters meet the delegates who must in turn educate the women in the villages and factory towns. Second, the conference is the debating ground extraordinary for the home women, workmen's wives whose money income is derived from their husbands' wages, and the working women in stores and factories. Considering how often in the past women workers have been used, if not as strike-breakers, at least as the undercutters of wages, this meeting of two groups of women has been needed to make clear to the wives of men trade unionists that for their own sakes and their husband's sakes the principle of equal pay for equal work must prevail, if the standards within an industry are not to be lowered. The cleavage between the home women and the women trade unionists is steadily growing less. Finally, the conference offers a forum for definite feminist propaganda, the furtherance of the women's franchise bill, the formulations of demands for more women candidates for Parliament, and the discussion of such subjects as birth control and other feminist issues.

Ellen Wilkinson opened the convention with a denunciation of the Churchill tax on artificial silk. "Every bit of color and gaiety is to be taken from the life of the working woman. Her hard-earned little fineries are to be taxed by nearly ten millions for the benefit of the richest people in the country." Ellen Wilkinson knows that to clerk and shopgirl neat appearance is a necessity if she is not to lose her job. She went from the Churchill tax to an analysis of the proposals for widows' pensions and compared the eighteen shillings a week proposed for a workman's widow with two children with the army private's widow's forty shillings. Dr. Marion Phillips, the energetic Australian who is chief woman officer of the Labor Party, reported 1,450 women's sections with a total membership of 200,000; and an increase in Labor women holding municipal, county, and district-council offices in the past year. This was salve to those delegates who feel keenly the loss of Dorothy Jewson, Margaret Bondfield, and Susan Lawrence in Parliament; and who have resented the ready alibi of certain of the men who lay the blame for the Baldwin victory on the women voters. Women voters, indeed. This conference chided Ramsay MacDonald for neglecting to make the women's franchise bill admitting the younger women a party issue.

The birth-control resolution which was carried read:

> This conference is of the opinion that it should be permissible for doctors employed in any medical service for which public funds are provided to give information on birth control to married people who desire it.

It is not illegal in England to distribute information in regard to contraceptives. The issue was whether the public health centers should do carefully and scientifically what so many women manage to do as best they can. Two years ago the subject was very timidly discussed. Last year Dora Russell and Freda Laski put through a resolution asking that the health centers give out such information, but the Roman Catholic Minister of Health in the Labor Government would not move. This year no two women "put through" the resolution. The whole floor was for it, with a few bitter exceptions who regard contraceptives as a frustration of God and the moral order. However, "I am a Catholic," said a stout motherly woman, climbing on her chair as is the custom for speakers from the floor, "and I want to say that the Catholics better be honest. They are practicing birth control if they've got the information." To two firm young socialists who rose to explain that birth control was an economic issue that would not survive the social revolution an earnest woman replied firmly: "Even in the cooperative commonwealth I think a woman will want to choose her time and say how many."

Another resolution which was passed unanimously called on the Labor Party "to deal stringently with any representative of the Labor Party who does not support sex equality, economically, educationally, and politically." The demand set forth in Ellen Wilkinson's opening speech that the Labor Party propose women candidates in a reasonable number of parliamentary seats was echoed in the resolution which demanded that "the women's sections immediately levy themselves a small weekly sum as a political fund for the express purpose of running working-women candidates for Parliament." There is a suspicion that certain of the men who direct Labor party affairs are willing to have women candidates but not in the sure districts, and that there is not the same zest in the men's efforts to raise campaign funds for the women that there is among the women to support the men.

Among the other resolutions passed were demands for a National Wheat Board to solve the problem of cheap bread, a demand for a trained nurse in every secondary and primary school, a demand for the passage of the women's franchise bill admitting the younger women to the polls. Various resolutions calling for an international conference of labor women; for enforcement of the Wheatley housing act, for family migration, and for study of the labor market in the colonies were all on the agenda.

These Englishwomen speak well, briefly, and with much caustic force. The various English dialects give a certain rich savor to the debate for an American observer. Noteworthy as contrasted with American meetings I have attended is the hard-mindedness and attentiveness of these women. The rank-and-file delegates, scrambling on their chairs to speak, match the platform in thoughtfulness and directness. The impression is of women who are going to fight to get their full share of power within the Labor Party. They intend that the men shall be helpmates in their feminist projects.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

THE debate on the censorship of literature has been reopened, all unwittingly, by the chief exponent of a censorship measure, none other than Justice Ford himself. To be sure, His Honor said nothing about literature; he rather expressed himself on the subject of cocktails and "these wild young people." But the principle remains the same. The Justice had noted that his daughter, following accepted mode, apparently even in official families, served cocktails to her guests and drank them herself, all the while remaining a respectable and decent member of society and a thoroughly nice young woman. Without going into the question of whether or not this is the same daughter who was so shocked by a reading of Mr. D. H. Lawrence's "Women in Love" that she brought the offending book to her father and started the censorship controversy, one can still remark that Justice Ford concludes that his daughter will not become a hopeless drunkard because of a few cocktails. Being of a generally sober disposition, she is not rendered helpless and morally unstable even by synthetic gin. This the Justice observes, all the while abstaining from cocktails himself because he does not like them.

* * * * *

THE Drifter contends that this completely ruins Mr. Ford as a champion of censorship. Every argument that he uses in favor of the sound reputation of his daughter applies with equal weight to those responsible members of society who wish to be allowed to choose their own literature. The Judge would find himself surrounded, if he took the trouble to inquire, with persons who have read or will read or are reading books which would be banned by the proposed censorship law, and who are as respectable and law-abiding citizens as the Judge's daughter herself. Quite aside from the question of Shakespeare and the Bible, those time-honored examples that are always quoted whenever censorship is discussed, the Drifter knows honest men and women who have read Aretinus and remained honest, who have pored over Mr. D. H. Lawrence and are still faithful to their wives or husbands, who know Boccaccio and do not sell their votes, who have even become acquainted with Mr. James Joyce's "Ulysses" and still keep out of jail.

* * * * *

THE final aspect of the situation becomes clear when one recalls that Mr. Ford not only dislikes cocktails, but that he makes a wry face when he sees them. And therefore, the Drifter supposes, no one compels him to drink them against his will. By the same token, no one compels him to read books which offend him. If he should reply that what he considers improper books are offered for public sale and for the ruination of public morals, one has only to point to the member of the judge's family who read "Women in Love," or enough of it to see what it was like, and who was not corrupted. Even as the officials of the vice society have read hundreds of improper books and looked at dozens of indecent post cards and have remained as pure as when they began, so, it seems safe to assume, would the ordinary citizen. Or perhaps it would be better to pass a censorship law and then wink at any violation of it by persons of sound mind, on the ground that they could take their questionable literature or leave it alone.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The Purging of Christianity

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The present religious struggle between fundamentalists and modernists, which seems to be the last stand of superstition and ignorance within the Christian church, appears to me as a purging, purifying process. The Christianity of today is undergoing a change hardly less important than that of the Reformation. We are getting back nearer to the essence of Christ's teaching when we eliminate literal adherence to those beliefs which run counter to scientific observation and knowledge.

The religion of the future will dispense with the earthly miracles as tests of orthodoxy. Christianity does not need them. They hurt Christianity by driving away from it many an honest and sincerely religious person who, because he cannot believe that Jonah emerged alive from a lengthy sojourn in a whale, or that Christ literally changed water into wine, or that God parted the waters of the Red Sea, or that Christ was born of a virgin, or that the body of the Christian rises from the grave finds himself *persona non grata* within the Christian church and accordingly leaves it. None of the miracles of the Christian tradition are so marvelous, as important to human life and conduct, as the known immensity of space, the speed of a radio wave through the ether, or the birth and growth of a human child. The real miracles are the human mind and its discoveries about the laws which govern this universe. The religion of the future will content itself with these miracles and will seek the supernatural not on this planet or any other but beyond the veil of death.

Modern science does not necessarily breed irreverence. Rather it is calculated to make man humble in the realization of the intelligence and order of the universe. It points convincingly to a mighty God—worthy of worship. In future generations the Christian will probably regard the present contentions of the fundamentalists with the same amused incredulity as that with which today we regard the speculations of medieval scholasticism as to how many angels could stand on the point of a needle.

Christianity will have been purged and purified when it seeks the truth about God and Christ through the channels of honest study rather than through the channels of superstition. It is more helpful to think that Christ was the son of two human parents, and that He, being like us, yet conquered the temptations of life and lived in perfect accord with the spirit of God. That He had an earthly father does not mean that He had no heavenly father or that He was any the less the Son of God.

It is not necessary for the Christian to believe in the resurrection of the body. It is just as difficult in fact to envisage a heaven in which these earthly bodies could be at home as to envisage the survival of our souls apart from our bodies.

All religions which are worthy of the name share the belief in "a spirit of things." Primitive animism, developed pantheism or monotheism hold this belief in a spirit life independent of matter. The Chinese nightly offer a portion of rice and a libation of tea or wine to the wandering shades of their ancestors, and when the "essence" has been consumed the priests from the nearby temple carry away the residue. Even highly civilized people feel a sense of fear when they pass a haunted house or graveyard at night. This feeling should strengthen the faith of those who, accepting the scientific fact that the body perishes, yet cling to a hope or belief that a spiritual life does survive death.

When modern science demonstrated as false or inaccurate certain myths which had been accepted as essentials of belief, the first consequence was that those who spoke authoritatively for the church were unable to adjust themselves to the new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discoveries by the simple expedient of analyzing these myths and declaring them (as they are in fact) to be unessential additions to the teachings of Christ, and those who accepted the scientific discoveries were forced out of the church or compelled to keep silent as to their views. Now, tardily, as the leadership of the church is passing into the hands of younger men and women who have been exposed to the new teachings of modern science, the church is adapting itself to the new order and upon examining the result finds that all which was of value still remains. Christ's own words ring as freshly and clearly as ever, and the church having gotten safely through with its period of introspection can again turn its energies into channels of new usefulness.

New York, June 16 A NEW YORK LAWYER

Artists, Take Notice

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: All artists who read at all read *The Nation*. So I should like to appeal, through your columns, to all the landscape painters of America to carry their rubbish away with them, and not leave rags impregnated with paint or tubes of paint behind them in fields and pastures, where they are likely to do damage to live stock. Actual harm has resulted to cattle in this neighborhood from carelessness of this kind, and rural America is acquiring a grudge against the careless artist, not unlike that which it already has against the careless tourist and picnicker.

Amenia, New York, June 2 AMY E. SPINGARN

A Memorial to Walt Whitman

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

Sir: As a member of the committee of the Authors' Club, which is undertaking to collect funds to raise a suitable memorial to Walt Whitman in New York, may I appeal through your columns to all persons who would like to subscribe to this effort to commemorate the greatest poet who has ever commemorated this city. Checks may be sent to the treasurer of the committee, William F. Dix, 34 Nassau Street, New York City.

West Cornwall, Conn., June 25 CARL VAN DOREN

America's Debt to Hyam Solomon

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A blot has been resting upon the American nation since 1776. It has shown ingratitude by ignoring the services of one of the greatest patriots of the revolutionary period, who financed and backed the government in freedom's cause, the great Polish Jew Hyam Solomon of New York and Philadelphia, banker and patriot of the first order.

The history of Hyam Solomon can be traced in every encyclopedia, but not a schoolbook in the United States has even mentioned him, not a poem has been written in his honor (except by John Fiske in his "History of the Hebrews in America," and in President Madison's correspondence to Edmund Randolph, and in the *Congressional Record* of Washington).

In 1917 and 1918 I asked President Wilson to direct the War Department to name one of the military camps the Hyam Solomon Camp. Adjutant General Reilly wrote me that President Wilson requested him to communicate with me on the matter, and that it had the hearty support of both President Wilson and the War Department. But the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the House defeated the plan.

Hyam Solomon died at the age of forty-five in Philadelphia, leaving a widow and two small children in great poverty; all his papers and the government's obligation to him were lost in those troublesome days of the revolutionary period and by the English who conquered Washington city in 1814. The United States has never recognized the services of this great historical figure, nor done justice to the memory of this unselfish and most sacrificing man for the American cause.

Senator Wadsworth, in correspondence between 1911 and 1915, promised me that he would gladly bring a bill in the United States Senate to put aside part of the interest on the loan of $660,000 in 1776, amounting today to over $180,000,000, to found and erect a university in Washington and name it the Hyam Solomon National University.

I call upon the entire American nation, the President and the Cabinet, every governor in the United States and every member of the Senate and House of Representatives to help in this move, especially the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Senators of Pennsylvania, and the Congressmen of Pennsylvania, and the Mayor of Philadelphia, to do their duty to a historical figure of their city. I trust that every intellectual person in the United States, every scholar, every diplomat, will indorse this move to give Hyam Solomon the honor he deserves from the American nation.

New York, June 20 LOUIS FRIEDMAN

The Other Side of Los Angeles

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your Los Angeles readers who, like us, read *The Nation* truculently in public and wonder who else reads it out here may be interested in knowing that there is one little group outside of Radicals, Inc., who definitely eschew the banal, the pretty-pretty tidiness of Los Angeles and the smugness of the Golden Plated West.

You have guessed it—the Little Theater Group. Some years ago the Potboilers were known to the public solely through frowzy handbills documented as "Bohemian" by their typographical horrors and cheap green paper. They met in the Mexican quarter and in Chinatown, and later on in an old firehouse. The neighborhood was redolent of tortillas, tamales, and stray tabbies.

A pallid attempt at a Village, some of us said, and never came again. But without any organization, with no money, they produced, first, "Beyond the Horizon," then "Six Characters in Search of an Author." Every newspaper in town hailed them. Then, to the credit of Hollywood, the movie contingent joined in the cheers. Mitchell Lewis volunteered for "The Hairy Ape" and gave a fine performance; and stayed to help scene-shift when the director's back gave out. Then "The Failures" was produced. Not so discouraging for Los Angeles now, is it? The newspapers give us columns of free publicity. In fact when the Potboilers had to move from the firehouse, which was a fire-trap as well, we hissed gleefully at each other: "Big theaters jealous! Jealous—s-s!!"

Now, in a messy little basement, they are rehearsing "The Life of Man." No one receives a cent of pay. Settings, costumes, publicity, acting, all are given freely. And there is no organization! No membership, no dues—chortle at that, our individualistic friends! Sigurd Russell, a high-school teacher, is the producer, with a genius for getting things done. Ole M. Ness is the director, who doesn't wear puttees or golf pants. He writes poetry and sells pianos during the day time, and not once has he fallen for the "sure-fire" or the banal in choosing his plays. He has genius, real genius, and a gift for making vital what might be merely literary. And he is modest and tactful. So we know the movies won't steal him.

The Andreyev play opens on May 4, hags, screams, tragedy, and all. There is news that MacLoon will put on "What Price Glory" here. "The Beggar on Horseback" plays at the Majestic now, and life in the Great Side-doors regains its savor. Now if only Upton Sinclair won't start in reading the Constitution or something out loud!

Los Angeles, April 23 ISABEL L. MAYERS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Your Portrait

By LEON HERALD

Like the day in space
Your portrait
Is framed within my vision
And hangs upon
The dust-proof wall
Of my soul.

(At the vanishing of day
Heaven becomes all eyes
Searching her lover, the Earth.)

Not to render my vision an empty night
I cling to your image as though
My thoughts of you were the flesh
In which you abide willingly.

Society and Scientific Method

Conservatism, Radicalism, and Scientific Method. By Albert Benedict Wolfe. The Macmillan Company. $3.50.

MR. WOLFE is above all a shrewd observer of the contemporary scene; so that when he writes of human attitudes toward the events of that scene one can be certain that he is informed concerning the facts, that he respects them, and that he is willing to listen to their faintest dictates. This may not at once seem important. Usually the psychological equipment of social commentators comes in for criticism first and the range of information upon which that equipment is used last, if indeed at all. But there is no possible justification for this neglect. The full use of the shrewdness—and by this is meant penetration to the significant events—of our social psychologists is the most important virtue we can demand of them at present. For there are no psychological laws; there is no generally accepted body of scientific truth from which to argue and within which to find a classifying niche for each happening of common life. We are beginning to see that the raw materials for psychologic generalization occur within the provinces of the observers in the various fields of social science. Especially the data of economics are also the data of social psychology. Economic behavior *is* psychology.

Of course there have been and still are numerous persons conceiving themselves to be gifted with knowledge concerning laws of psychology which catch up into the broad scope of their generalizations the behavior of people everywhere. And sometimes, as for example in the case of Mr. McDougall, they have sounded plausible. But so far as the enlightenment of the springs of behavior goes, or for that matter the better guidance of social activity, they have attained slight results. And this was partly, at least, because they had no equipment of insight. Fruitfulness in this field of activity seems to depend upon a beginning in shrewdness and a subsequent development by rigid adherence to mechanistic sequence and expectation and upon the method that is sometimes called behavioristic. Other kinds of effort develop loosely symmetrical structures of logic that fail utterly to fit the facts unless the facts are subjected to a bath of mysticism which so transfigures them that they become the very ones needed to fit the logical structure. What this leads to may be anything—it certainly cannot be the useful and relevant generalization which assists in human guidance.

Of course what is involved in all this is a very old quarrel between the adherents of the purposive and those of the mechanistic explanation of events. Doubtless Mr. Wolfe errs in believing himself more completely mechanistic than he is. But when Mr. McDougall undertakes to lecture him at length (as he did in a recent issue of the *American Economic Review*) for his formal adherence to the mechanistic explanation he shows himself to be involved in the deeper confusion. He forgets the usefulness of either or both forms of explanation. Edwin Ray Gutherie has suggested that both categories be more or less deflated and attention concentrated on the idea that neither is valuable except that it assists in the prediction of developing phenomena and the attainment therefore of some control over the future. As has been suggested already, however, there is a certain danger in the purposive that must not be overlooked: that of congealed preconceptions which distort facts and so hinder thinking. Essentially, Mr. Wolfe is right in wanting to ally himself formally with the mechanists. But it is difficult to see that it affects his work one way or the other.

One thing that interests him is the genesis of our attitudes. And he is willing to make certain classifications at the very start for the sake of definition; but he would be the first to admit human behavior to be so very various as to make any classification something less than permanent and rigid. It can be said that there are conservatives and that there are radicals; also it can be said that there are certain recognizably different groups among them. On this basis one can look about at the behavior of groups and can see that the consequences of adherence to an emotionally determined attitude are usually bad—and this whether or not the emotions have been rationalized subsequently. These general bad effects lead to the wish that a more seriously rational basis for attitudinizing might be found. Here the social psychologist comes fairly up against his main problem: the discovery of ways and means toward what Santayana called the life of reason.

The process of working out a better planning of the enterprise of life involves the analysis of situations in which individuals of our time have to function. It involves the analysis of characteristic modes of behavior in characteristic situations and the careful working out of some criteria as tentative guides to action. This last is the science of ethics. Thus we may learn to behave so that our behavior may become progress. But it requires a kind of guidance by rational programs that is possible only to the best minded.

Unfortunately no one who is alive to the realities of existence carries a very certain faith in the spread of ethical—in this sense—behavior. Certain departments of our lives may be brought to a budgetary standard; it seems to most thinkers hardly likely that all departments may. But when we turn a little aside from this rigid viewpoint and center attention on the fundamental fact that we do act and that we many times act with a pre-view, we begin to see possibilities of the analysis of action and of the further analysis of what it is that gives content to various pre-views. Perhaps—who knows—we may be able to change that content!

Pre-views are largely determined by attitudes, and attitudes tend to evaluate forms of action so differently that there is a constantly recurring sequence of social conflict. The social psychologist tears his thinking away from the direct attempt to persuade men to a wholly rational basis of action and tries to get him to see the social degeneracy involved in the grinding friction of these conflicts. Is it possible to compromise them, he asks. And here, wonderfully, it seems possible to Mr. Wolfe that we may find ourselves attaining the higher goal in the struggle for the lower one. For a conflict of interests, he feels, can be resolved only by "opponents coming to agreement on some common ethical ground—that is, by such redefinition of their interests and modification of their attitudes as will lead them to judge the facts of the situation by some higher standard of ethical valuation. . . . Briefly, and excluding from consideration at this point the problem of de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciding between ends . . . they are not to be settled by brute force, dogmatic appeal to authority and precedent; or trickery, emotional frumpery, and chicane; but by the arbitrament of fact. . . . The moral function of the scientific method is to rationalize interest conflicts." And so, by compromise, we actually move ahead.

This belief that something may come of so finely tempered a tool as this we have forged in scientific method rests very largely upon the feeling that it is our only dependence in a civilization whose very mechanical refinements have made it, as a whole, mysterious to the normal mind. Its elaborated correlative structures have been spun into too intricate a web. The eye of the mind loses its grasp in following out the stresses of existence and comes to rest finally in utter defeat. In this extremity nothing remains but the emotions. Intelligence requires assistance to master the machinery of our industrial life and to prevent the wrecking of delicate relationships by the desperate application of crude emotional controls. And organized intelligence possesses the scientific method. This is the key, then, to progress? Well, that is perhaps too much to say, particularly when one examines the exact meaning of "scientific method," including as it does the necessity for the rigorous selection and analysis of data, for the establishment of tentative uniformities, and for the experimental control of developing phenomena. It does not look so much like a key when it is examined in this fashion. It looks more like a potential mental discipline for normal minds, by which, however, society may possibly raise itself by its bootstraps.

How to achieve this discipline? Mr. Wolfe says by education. By, in fact, plowing it in to the very soil of the educative process. "The attitudinal reform requisite to the efficiency and safety of the Great Society can come only through education. . . . Always, wherever we start, we come back to education. . . . When history placed industrialism and political democracy in one side of the scales, it called for ethical democracy, objective sympathy, social knowledge, and the scientific spirit in the other. It is the function of teachers, wherever they may be working, to put them there."

REXFORD GUY TUGWELL

Abraham Walkowitz

One Hundred Drawings. By Abraham Walkowitz. B. W. Huebsch, Inc. $10.

DURING the past ten years, most notably in Independent Society Exhibitions, in one-man shows, and in illustrated books, we have become familiar with the work of young artists in the experimental stage of their careers under the influence of Cézanne, Picasso, Matisse, and others. And these imitative or derivative experiments, despite their value to the striving young creator, are of no particular interest to the art-loving spectator. As a rule, one artist smitten by the structural principles and mannerisms of Cézanne is no more interesting than any other artist so obsessed. We are treated to the same type of composition, the same distorted perspective, the same modulation of tones to enforce the illusion of volume. And so it is with all other such imitative documents. We can see no great significance in them. When an artist in whatever medium has left an enduring impress upon his generation—only then are we willing to examine patiently every casual fragment of his work that remains. We are willing to study his sources merely because he is Keats or Rembrandt or Turner. On the lower levels of artistic creation, and in the work of men who have but recently "arrived," we are not so scrupulous or so interested. We put on trial first their ultimate selves, their honest artistic convictions about life.

The present volume undeniably contains work that represents a genuine personal vision, but it contains too much that does not. One is wearied by the profusion of drawings revealing Mr. Walkowitz posturing first in one borrowed manner, then in another. Like Carl Sandburg, he is inclined to attach an unwarranted significance to every scrawl he happens to have set down. But, like Carl Sandburg too, let it not be forgotten, he has a unique idiom. One feels this most in his decorative panels, in the monotypes and in certain studies of the figure. In the panels, which deal chiefly with idyllic subject matter, there is a lyrical tenderness, a naive grace in the drawing of the figures and in their decorative ordering. They are lovely in their quiet rhythm and in their fresh, unaffected, primitive quality. To pass from this static pastoral mood to the fiery energy of the monotypes is a startling transition. It is like leaping from a still woodland pool into a maelstrom. The intricate play of form in such monotypes as The Bathers and Human Rhythm is conceived in a spirit of passionate intensity admirably controlled by a coolly functioning aesthetic judgment. And the medium itself seems peculiarly sympathetic to Mr. Walkowitz's tactile impressions. Its fluid response to what he wants to say is almost complete. In the precarious art of the monotype, a demon of the incalculable is constantly intruding either to mar the artist's intent or to delight him with some lovely accident. Mr. Walkowitz appears to have this demon on his side most of the time, and to succeed in keeping him nimbly engaged in the service of beauty. In his drawings of the nude Mr. Walkowitz is uneven. He always achieves weight, and feels the big generalities of form. Many of his action studies are perversely crude and tend to overstatement, although the fine Isadora Duncan series cannot be thus indicted. He is at his best in really sensitive studies such as Baby, The Bather, A Study, and Elevation. Mr. Walkowitz's book is formidably prefaced with four critical introductions by Henry McBride, John Weichsel, Charles Vildrac, and Willard Huntington Wright, all adulatory and none of any great value as criticism. Mr. McBride's essay is the most readable.

GLEN MULLIN

The Ethics of Naturalism

Ethics—Origin and Development. By Prince Kropotkin. Translated by Louis Friedland and Joseph R. Piroshnikoff. The Dial Press. $4.

PRINCE KROPOTKIN had planned a work on ethics in two volumes, the first dealing with the origin and development of morality, the second with moral ideals. At the time of his death the first volume, which now appears in translation, was practically completed. The second was never written.

For Kropotkin morality means essentially altruism, the sacrifice of personal happiness in the interests of social solidarity. His problem is this: "Why does man so often renounce that which would unquestionably give him pleasure? Why does he suffer all kinds of privations in order not to violate his moral ideal?" His position may roughly be described as naturalism. The term is ambiguous, for it may mean either opposition to supernaturalism or opposition to humanism. In the first sense it is the attempt to find the origin and justification of morality in human nature and not in the Will of God or the Universal Reason or any similar mysterious source. In the second sense it is the attempt to obliterate the distinction between man's human and animal natures and to explain morality in terms of non-moral factors.

Kropotkin founds morality upon the nature of man, but the peculiar interest of his position is that although he exhibits morality as a purely natural fact he escapes the familiar charge of "leveling down," for he undertakes to prove that morality is natural by showing that nature is moral. Following out the ideas already made familiar by his "Mutual Aid," he asserts that the animal kingdom is not red in tooth and claw but that, on the contrary, "Mutual Aid is the predominant fact of nature." In animal societies, he says (although his conclusions go far beyond what the evidence warrants), you have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the individual identifying itself with the group, you have sympathy, you have self-sacrifice. We find here "an indication of the natural origin not only of the rudiments of ethics but also of the higher ethical feelings." Even "the very ideas of bad and good, and man's abstractions concerning 'the supreme good,' have been borrowed from Nature. They are reflections in the mind of man of what he saw in animal life and in the course of his social life." He explains duty in the same way. Elaborating Darwin's account in "The Descent of Man," he contends that mutual aid, being necessary for the preservation, the welfare, and the progressive development of the species, has become the strongest and most permanent force in human nature. When some anti-social or ephemeral impulse opposes this force the resulting friction is what we know as conscience.

Nine of the thirteen chapters are concerned with tracing the development of ethical theory from primitive times up to the evolutionary ethics of the nineteenth century, always, of course, from the point of view of naturalism. Thus the Greek philosophers are said to have been right in declaring that morality was natural to man and depended neither on revelation nor on the fear of punishment; but their eudaemonism failed to explain why man finds satisfaction in acting morally. The importance of the French thinkers of the eighteenth century is that they "helped to bring society to a realization of the fact that morality can be completely liberated from the sanction of religion." The merit of Kant is that his search for a "new, purely scientific ethics" helped to "prepare the way for the evolutionary ethics of our time." In view of this last statement it is not surprising that Herbert Spencer gets a chapter to himself, as does Guyau. (Incidentally, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle get twelve pages between them.)

Two criticisms may be offered. The first concerns the value of the work as a history of ethics. In principle there is no objection to the writing of a history of philosophy by a man who has a position of his own to defend; in fact, the method has distinct value. But it also has its dangers, chief among which are false perspective (treating systems as approximations to or aberrations from the truth, i. e., the author's truth) and the doing of actual violence to the thought of the writers considered. Kropotkin avoids neither danger. Of the first I have given some examples above. Here is an example of the second. Referring to Plato's doctrine of love, he says: "His Eros was also what we now call sociality, mutual sympathy, the feeling which . . . permeates the whole world of living creatures." Kropotkin would have done better to use his historical material as illustrative, for that is actually the value it has in his mind.

The second criticism has to do with his own theory. In his eagerness to show that morality is natural he overlooks the weakness, so often pointed out, in his type of naturalism. Briefly it is this: How can any fact of the natural order, e. g., animal solidarity, sympathy, self-sacrifice, tell man how he ought to behave? Mutual aid may be a strong "permanent instinct," but this fact only explains why man does obey it: it cannot tell him why he ought to obey it, nor, if he disobey, can it tell him why he should feel remorse. Duty remains as mysterious as ever. And it is just this element of mystery that all "supernaturalistic" theories recognize.

CHARLES A. BENNETT

The Liberal Jew

A New Approach to the Problems of Judaism. By Mordecai Kaplan. New York: The Society for the Advancement of Judaism. Seventy-five cents.

Survival or Extinction; Social Aspects of the Jewish Question. By Elisha M. Friedman. Thomas Seltzer. $2.50.

Liberalizing Liberal Judaism. By James Waterman Wise. The Macmillan Company. $1.50.

AT last the Jew has paid himself the high compliment of criticism. By turning on his own problems the analytical faculties which he exerts on all other questions he has testified to a faith in his power of self-improvement and to a pride in the task of self-determination. Hitherto it has been the habit of the Jewish people to plead with God and to appeal to the Gentiles for alleviation of the wretched conditions which they were obliged to endure; it has been their belief that they could ease their lot by sounding pitiful lamentations to the Almighty and by serving a humiliating tribute to the oppressor. But now the Jews are realizing that their salvation rests neither on the bounty of God nor on the mercy of the Gentile; they are learning at last that none but themselves can and will solve the Jewish question and relieve the misery of Israel.

The publication of these volumes testifies to this new attitude and evinces the different course. The books form a threefold inquiry into Jewish life during the period of Exile—into the development and direction of the Jewish outlook, into the strength and survival of Jewish national traits, and into the value and variation of Jewish religion. And they all urge the readjustment of Jewish life into more normal and, therefore, more logical and more honorable channels.

The first, Rabbi Kaplan's volume of essays, is the most eloquent as it is the most profound approach to these problems of readjustment. Mr. Kaplan conceives Judaism not as a religious philosophy but as a religious civilization. "It is a cultural and spiritual complex of language, literature, history, customs, and social institutions organized about a conception of God which has the most far-reaching social and spiritual implications for human life of all times. . . . Judaism is the spirit of a nation and not the cult of a denomination." And hence his measure of the Jewishness, religious or national, of any individual is the extent to which the individual identifies himself with the organism of the Jewish people. In this theory the solution of the Jewish problem centers on the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state. For a Jewish nation will serve to unify the distinctive forces which underlie every vital Jewish contribution to civilization and it will revitalize within every Jew, no matter where he has his being, the peculiar powers and attributes of his people.

Mr. Friedman is in complete accord with these views. His work is a consideration of the numerous social aspects of Jewish life which force the Jew, on pain of extinction, to accept these concepts; and his proofs are many and various. Mr. Friedman shows the futility of the promiscuous and perverted solutions which the desperate and disorganized Jews have sought for their troubles; he studies the social forces to which the Jewish people is subject and finds that they relentlessly lead to extinction. He, too, points to Palestine as the only means of a national survival and the only justification of a distinct Jewish people. Incidentally he indicates that the contributions of the Jews during exile have been incomparably inferior to their earlier achievements, since by dispersion "they have lost the power to contribute as a people to the harmony of world culture."

The authors are agreed that the most enervating influence in Jewish life has been the Reform Movement, which cast off the ancient garb of orthodox religion and thereby destroyed the distinguishing and cohesive characteristics of the Jewish mode of life. It raised to the dignity of a religious doctrine the process of assimilation to the Gentile world and thus undermined the foundations of its own existence. Mr. Wise concerns himself primarily with this movement and considers the other questions of Jewish life incidentally. As an ordained minister in the Reformed Synagogue and a disciple of its greatest figures in England and America, he is able to investigate intimately and sympathetically but none the less truly its achievements and failings. He credits it with "the enfranchisement of the spirit from those customs and traditions of Rabbinic or Orthodox Judaism which had ceased to have meaning and purpose"; for he, like his teachers, is under the influence of nineteenth-century liberalism, which ignored the aesthetic value of ancient ritual and saw in it only the bonds of dogma. But he justly inscribes on the debit side the equally dogmatic, false, and noxious doctrine of a Jewish mission which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was substituted by the leaders of "Liberal Judaism" to distinguish the resulting creed from the other forms of Unitarianism. Mr. Wise, in common with Mr. Friedman and Mr. Kaplan, attacks the fallacy of this "Mission of Israel." And the reviewer, who has been characterized as a prime and blaspheming opponent of this dogma, finds the indictment both sacred and satisfactory.

Though all of the authors have discussed the Jewish problem with the intimacy that presupposes a concern with and a knowledge of the subject, only Rabbi Wise writes his criticism from within. He addresses a limited audience even in Jewish circles. The other works may be safely recommended to the Gentile reader who is interested in the Jewish question and in the first rational Jewish efforts to solve it since Herzl's *"Judenstaat."*

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO

Musical Brevities

Crotchets. A Few Short Musical Notes. By Percy A. Scholes. Oxford University Press. $2.50.

MR. SCHOLES gives his "Crotchets" a modest subtitle. The fact is, within a compass of less than three hundred pages he offers the reader fifty-four thoughtful little essays on matters of music whose brevity is pleasantly charged with its proverbial association. The range of these papers is wide. The first one asks the pertinent question: "What does the audience hear?" Mr. Scholes does not mean this or that new or bewildering composition; he asks what an assemblage of supposed listeners really hears when it is seated in the presence of, say, Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. "I am prompted to ask this question," he explains, "by one or two recent disasters. At a Three Choirs Festival the Franck symphony was played. . . . The conclusion of the first movement was taken by the cleric in charge for the conclusion of the whole piece, whereupon he pronounced the Benediction and discharged the congregation." Really, little as he may suspect it, Mr. Scholes is pleading here for the friendly guidance of a thoroughly trained and benevolent claque! Thus unwary clerics will avoid disaster, concert audiences will not bury with ill-timed applause the upward-rushing scales in the final measure of Chopin's A minor etude, and the crowd at the opera house will await in silence the coda of the "Pagliacci" prologue.

In one of the papers collectively entitled Kreisleriana Mr. Scholes pleads, as every frequent attendant at concerts feels like doing, for a widening of the violinists' repertory. He wonders whether Fritz Kreisler, with his enormous prestige and his hold over audiences, would not be just the man to accomplish something in that direction. "Why always the Chaconne?" continues Mr. Scholes. "Bach wrote six suites and partitas, comprising over two dozen movements. The Chaconne is merely one of these movements. Recently Kreisler played it on a Wednesday, Czaplinski on the following Monday, and Losowsky on the previous Wednesday. . . . Kreisler has not lately played us any Beethoven sonatas, but if he does so I should hope to find him deliberately neglecting the overplayed Kreutzer, and giving us instead, perhaps, one of the three in Op. 30—preferably the great C minor." In a footnote Mr. Scholes informs us that shortly after these words were written Mr. Kreisler announced a program which included Tartini's hackneyed "Devil's Trill" and Beethoven's "Kreutzer"!

The papers on Handel and Bach seem to have been written before the recent Handel revival, which in Germany within the last two or three years has made a number of the long-neglected Handel operas festival affairs. Mr. Scholes does protest against the present English underrating of Handel—a natural enough reaction from an excessive earlier deification—but he is a lukewarm, apologetic, and rather unappreciative champion. Wanda Landowska would expel him from the lists in a jiffy. What Mr. Scholes does tackle with particular spirit and efficiency is the difficult array of contemporary problems.

Anybody who shivers at the very thought of polytonality and atonality will find illumination and comfort in the papers on those subjects. *Color and Sound,* apropos the "Color Symphony" of Arthur Bliss, reaches this common-sense, if not exhaustive, conclusion: "The fact is, I think, that music can arouse emotions and that colors can do the same, and that what connection there is between music and color is not physical and direct, but subjective and via emotion. . . . A trumpet fanfare suggests joy; red to me suggests joy; hence a trumpet fanfare to me suggests red. That is my idea of the matter!"

The late Alexander Scriabin is no longer such an immediately urgent issue as he used to be, but he is still important enough to make the five Notes on Scriabin a singularly satisfactory summary of a once troubling composer whom we are now glad to appraise and classify. and so in a sense be rid of. Stravinsky, of course, still has the center of the stage. As regards this very ponderable Russian, Mr. Scholes in his three "Views," while by no means unsympathetic toward his composer, has relishing and wholesome fun with the pretensions and pomposities of stampeded commentators.

PITTS SANBORN

Books in Brief

London Life in the XVIIIth Century. By M. Dorothy George. Alfred A. Knopf.

China and Europe. Intellectual and Artistic Contacts in the Eighteenth Century. By Adolf Reichwein. Alfred A. Knopf.

Two volumes in the ambitious "History of Civilization" from which ten titles have thus far appeared in America. In view of the limits of the series—two hundred volumes—these monographs seem perilously specialized, and indeed it appears that the original project as conceived in France is to be somewhat distorted through its English handling. In itself Mrs. George's study of London's improvement over an important century is excellent; and the slighter German work on Chinese thought and art in Europe is suggestive if by no means complete.

THEATER

Every evening except Monday, 8:30 sharp
Matinees, Saturday, 2:30 sharp
The Grand Street Follies of 1925
Orchestra $2 Balcony $1.50

ARTHUR HOPKINS presents
"WHAT PRICE GLORY"
A new Play by Maxwell Anderson and Laurence Stallings
PLYMOUTH THEATRE 45th St. W. of B'way. Evs. 8:30. Mats. Thursday and Saturday.

A Civilized Picture of Uncivil People
BEGGAR ON HORSEBACK
Intelligently Directed by James Cruze
CRITERION B'way & 44th 2:40 TWICE DAILY 8:40 A Paramount Picture

When writing to advertisers, please mention The Nation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conversations on Contemporary Drama. By Clayton Hamilton. The Macmillan Company. $2.

A series of lectures delivered in the Y. M. C. A. Building of Columbia University by a speaker who regrets the death of intelligent dramatic criticism in America but thinks Pinero great and Shaw tedious. Owing partially perhaps to the fact that lectures are likely to be a little thin, the book contains surprisingly few ideas (even wrong ones) per hundred pages.

Obedience. By Michael Sadleir. Houghton Mifflin Company. $2.

Mr. Sadleir, whose first novel, "Privilege," stamped him as a writer worth watching, has turned his back on the fevers of the contemporary scene to lay a curious finger on the pulse of the last century. In the England of more than half a century ago he discovers the germs of that feminine revolt against authority of family and station which has since done so much to disturb the tranquillity of the social world. Most of the symptoms are discernible in the headstrong young lady who is his heroine. The author has endowed her with much spirit and color, but he has surrounded her with lay figures, so that the novel as a whole is lacking in vitality.

Anecdotes of the Late Samuel Johnson, LL.D. By Hesther Lynch Piozzi. Edited by S. C. Roberts. Cambridge University Press. 7/6.

A welcome reprint of "Pozzy's" contribution to the great Johnson legend.

Walt Whitman. A Study and a Selection. By Gerald Bullett. J. B. Lippincott Company.

As sumptuously printed as it is critically conceived.

We Visit Old Inns. By Mary Harrod Northend. Small, Maynard and Company. $3.

A richly illustrated tour of certain New England taverns.

Vondel. By A. J. Barnouw. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.

The first satisfactory account in English of a great Dutch poet.

The Natural History of Selborne. By Gilbert White. With notes by Richard Kearton and 85 photographs. Robert M. McBride and Company. $6.

Excellently printed on wide pages, bound in buckram, and illustrated with many photographs taken in Selborne itself, this must remain for some time to come the most desirable edition of a perennially precious book.

Egypt. By E. A. Wallis Budge. Henry Holt and Company. $1.

A distinguished addition to the Home University Library, which is one of the most valuable of contemporary series.

Farmington. By Clarence Darrow. Boni and Liveright. $2.

This autobiography of a memorable youth here finds its third publisher.

The Portrait of Zélide. By Geoffrey Scott. Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.75.

A brilliant account in full of the shadowy Madame de Charrière, whom Boswell once loved as Isabella de Zuylen.

Dora Wordsworth: Her Book. By F. V. Morley. Houghton Mifflin Company. $2.

A study of the Wordsworth group through the pages of Dora's album.

The Best Plays of 1923-1924. By Burns Mantle. Small, Maynard and Company. $2.50.

The fifth of Mr. Mantle's invaluable annual volumes. It contains a complete statistical summary of the theatrical year, the cast and synopsis of every play produced, and various other facts arranged for ready reference as well as the condensed versions of ten representative plays which give the volume its name.

In the Land of Youth. By James Stephens. The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

In comparison with the heroes of Welsh and Irish mythology, the legendary figures invented by the Teutonic imagination seem to be quiet men leading uneventful lives. Mr. Stephens plunges into the boundless extravagance characteristic of the legends of his country and produces a tale which achieves a wild beauty and a distinctive flavor. The impudent humor of some of his books is, however, noticeably less abundant here.

The Northern Muse. An Anthology of Scots Vernacular Poetry. Arranged by John Buchan. Houghton Mifflin Company. $3.

A copious selection, ranging from Barbour to Stevenson, and leavened with intelligent comment.

Poems for Youth. An American Anthology. Compiled by William Rose Benét. E. P. Dutton and Company. $3.

By no means a merely juvenile volume. Running from Halleck and Bryant to Hilda Conkling, it gives an excellent survey of the more spirited and lucid examples of American verse.

"During the year 1921, in Great Britain, of persons over 30 years of age, one out of every seven died of cancer."

CANCER AND THE PUBLIC

By CHARLES P. CHILDE is a full discussion of what is known as to the causes and the cure of cancer and of how the public could help prevent it. $4.25

A book to keep at hand to lend or give to any worried friend is

THE CONQUEST OF CANCER

By H. W. S. WRIGHT. It is one of those stimulating "Today and Tomorrow" volumes described as "Immensely valuable and infinitely readable." $1.00

It is shown that 75% of cancer cases are curable, with a mortality of 5%.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., 681 Fifth Avenue, New York

THE EVOLUTION OF MAN

By WILHELM BOELSCHE. A brief, simple and clear statement of the case for evolution, including much evidence discovered since Darwin's death. Can be read in two hours. Cloth, illustrated, 60 cents postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & CO., 347 East Ohio Street, Chicago.

MT. AIRY (near Croton-on-Hudson) is a community for artists and radicals within commuting distance of New York. It is high, dry and heavily wooded with many beautiful views of the Hudson and easy access to a service of 100 trains daily. Adjoining the village of Croton with shops and stores, it will have a social and communal life all its own. 1-4 acre of land $250 to $400. Cash or terms. (30% sold). Address Harry Kelly, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Chelsea 0432.

accept nothing but

Non Depressant
non Habit Forming
In Convenient
Aluminum Boxes
At every drug store

3 Tablets 15c.
10 Tablets 40c

Midol for HEADACHE

GENERAL DRUG CO., - 94 N. Moore Street, New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

The Serbo-Croat Dispute

By HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG

THE Jugoslav political situation reached an important turning-point on March 27 with the formal declaration of policy in the Skupshtina at Belgrade by Paul Radich, nephew of Stephen Radich, leader of the Croat Peasant Party. The more important passages of this historic statement are printed below.

It will be remembered that in July, 1923, Stephen Radich, fearing arrest on account of his propaganda for a separate Croat republic and his attacks on the Karageorgevich dynasty and the alleged militarism of Belgrade, left Jugoslavia. A few months later, after futile appeals for support in London and Paris, Radich went to Moscow. There he became a member of the Peasant International, of which the president is Smyrnov, Soviet Commissar of Agriculture. Further, he began arrangements for the affiliation of the Croat Peasant Party with the Peasant International, an action which won the approval of the deputies belonging to the Croat Peasant Party when they met at Zagreb on August 3, 1924. This further incensed the Belgrade Government, who were already only too prone to believe evil of Radich because of his record as a supporter of the Hapsburgs during the war, his relations with the Macedo-Bulgar revolutionists, and the trouble he was giving them by stirring up the Croat peasantry. The belief that Radich had definitely thrown in his lot with Moscow gained support by his series of intemperate speeches last summer during the time when the unfortunate Serb opposition leader, Davidovich, was engaged in precarious negotiations for the formation of a coalition cabinet in which Radich himself should participate. Particular wrath was aroused by a statement by Radich (at Zagreb on October 23, 1924) in which he said:

> I went to Moscow as the representative of the Croat people and the whole world has recognized me as such. If a militarist government should be formed, as desired at Belgrade, we shall succeed with the aid of Europe in obtaining complete independence. The Soviet Government has promised me, through the medium of Chicherin, that it will help us if we are threatened. In such a case we shall oppose the rule of Belgrade with all our strength.

This was followed by the admission by Dr. Matchek, a Radich leader and vice-president of the Skupshtina, that he had been visiting Vienna for the purpose of consulting officials at the Soviet legation there.

On January 1, 1925, the Government issued a decree dissolving the Croat Peasant Party, citing as authority an anti-communist law entitled the Law for the Protection of Public Security and Order, passed in 1922 by the Pachich majority in Parliament with the support of the Serb Democrats and other opposition groups. A day or so later Radich was put in jail, along with Dr. Matchek and four other of his associates, and remained there during the campaign preceding the election of February 8. At this election the Radich forces maintained their parliamentary representation practically intact (losing only 3 out of 70 members) while the combined forces of Premier Pachich were increased by 31 (from 131 to 162).

When the Skupshtina met on March 7 Radich was still in jail. The question facing the Pachich Government was whether the governmental majority should vote to validate the mandates of the Radich deputies or should declare their election illegal by virtue of the Law for the Protection of Public Security and Order, which outlaws communists. The question facing Radich was whether he should make plain his intention of utilizing constitutional means to achieve his ends or whether he should persist in his policy of republicanism and Croat separatism and should proceed to invoke the aid of the Soviet Government in promoting a revolution. The immediate danger was that the more intransigent associates of Pachich would make it seem useless for Radich to offer any compromise, and that they would expel all the Radich deputies and proceed to hold new elections with the avowed purpose of forcing the election of their creatures. Fortunately, moderate counsels prevailed. It was indicated to Radich's representatives that a repudiation of Moscow would be met half way by Pachich.

On March 27 Paul Radich made his formal statement of policy on behalf of his uncle and in the name of the Croat Peasant Party. As will be seen below, it represents a *volte-face* on many important points. As a result, Parliament voted approval of the mandates of the Radich deputies who had been elected for the first time (i. e., who had not been members of the Skupshtina while their party was negotiating with Moscow); the mandates of Radich and his four associates awaiting trial on specific charges of treason were definitely annulled; and the mandates of the balance were left for examination by a commission of inquiry, which on June 22 voted to seat the entire last named group of deputies.

The trial of Radich has not yet taken place, but it seems more than possible that it is being delayed in order to see whether a compromise cannot be worked out, by which Radich himself, or his representatives, will enter a coalition cabinet and assume a share of the responsibility for putting into operation the reforms which the Croats have been demanding. Even if this does not at once occur, it can fairly be said that the Serbo-Croat dispute has entered a new stage.

Speech of Paul Radich

> It is necessary to recall what we Croats were under the old Austro-Hungarian monarchy. We were often more or less submerged. We had continually to fight for our own laws, our customs, institutions, and autonomy, but we were never simply slaves. For one thousand years our Croatian juridic system has been maintained. Then we aimed at independence; now we aim at equality with our brethren in this same independence which has been gained. Belgrade of today does not stand to us in the same relation as Vienna of yesterday. Here we feel ourselves in our own house. . . .
>
> Our republicanism does not force us to demand any particular form of government. We want the substance rather than the shadow. The opposition bloc took form at a moment when we realized that the idea of a national accord was understood in Serbia. . . . However, at this moment the constitution of Vidovdan rules. We recognize this fact as we recognize the dynasty of Karageorgevich. (Applause.) We simply desire that our system evolve little by little along normal ways toward certain adjustments of differences due to the existence of the Croat and Slovene minorities. Our ethnic unity is incontestable, but our past history with its consequences has created three national consciences with three different names for the three divi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sions of our people. We are forced by natural circumstances to join our forces. We must so work that out of this material unity a spiritual one will be evolved which will make us solid and substantial on the basis of our present state. . . .

Nothing is eternal in this world and nothing is perfect. We must have a constitution, and no one will affrm that the constitution of Vidovdan is an eternal and lasting one, and not subject to change. Reference has been made to our long abstention from participation in the government. Gentlemen, if it took two years to get us into this predicament it will surely take time to get us out of it and to a proper understanding. We are beginning to be understood in Serbia. We earnestly desire a fraternal accord.

Passing to the subject of communism, Mr. Radich said it seemed to him that there had been much misunderstanding with regard to the bitter fight made by the Radich Party in its first years against communism, which at that time was a serious danger.

It must be remembered that at that time the authorities practically put no restraint on communist propaganda, which continued to strike with violence on our political activity. . . . We have always had a fight on two fronts—on the one hand, against the centralist forces; on the other, against the extremists. . . .

Concerning our relations with the Peasant International, Mr. Maximovich has read innumerable documents which I will not analyze judicially because I am not a lawyer, but which I will simply comment on from the point of view of common sense. This mass of evidence consists almost exclusively of letters addressed to Mr. Stephen Radich and to our party, but there is practically nothing from us. People can write to us whatever they wish, but that they do so does not involve our approval or consent. Two capital factors must be accentuated. The first one is that we did not designate an official representative to the Peasant International, as we had been invited to do. The second is that our Central Committee has made no definite decision as to the adhesion to the Peasant International. When our Central Committee can meet it will take the necessary steps to establish positively that we have no relations with the Peasant International.

We recognize integrally the situation created by the constitution of Vidovdan, with the dynasty of the Karageorgevich. (Applause.) . . . We recognize that any modifications in the existing condition of things must be made by a revision of the constitution, effected in fraternal accord by Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. We have never fought against the state as such or against its interest. The resistance of the population to certain conditions to which I shall make allusion has been unjustly qualified as being anti-state. The conditions which existed on the eve, during, and after the elections can only create discord and ultimately be fatal to our state. As earnest believers in its future we will contribute all in our power to insure the collaboration of the Croat population in honest good faith for the consolidation of the state—a collaboration which can only be realized on a basis of absolute equality. If this consolidation cannot come after we enter into Parliament, and after we have adhered without reserve to the program read by Mr. Davidovich, the general policy of the Croat people will be forced to change and we shall be powerless to help it; we shall lose direction of the political situation.

As our political organization has existed for twenty years we have experience, power, and moral authority sufficient to guarantee the integral consent of our electorate to any accord which will demonstrate respect for the law and for the will of the people. We do not fear that we shall be reproached with having surrendered. Bad faith may perhaps be charged against us by such journals as the *Balkan*, but during the last electoral campaign we showed under the most difficult conditions that we will not be broken and that we cannot be made to flinch. More than that, we are willing that it be said that we have given way, because if we do so it is a concession to our own Serbian brothers and for the good of our common future. (Applause.) . . .

With regard to the Peasant International of Moscow, all information coming from foreign sources, English, American, and French, can only confirm our point of view, which is that it has nothing in common with the Comintern, that is to say, with the Communist International. Still less is it an organization belonging to the latter. Independently of this fact, and of the fact that the Croat Peasant Party has not yet adhered definitely to the Peasant International, I declare now that we have taken no engagement and that we have no relations with this Peasant International, and our Central Committee will officially establish this fact at its first meeting. On August 3, 1924, our parliamentary group took up the report of its president, in which he stated that the Croat Peasant Party should join the Peasant International on the condition that it would maintain integrally its own program and tactics. He stressed the fact that he only saw in this the establishment of relations between the Russian people and the Croat people, and that this Peasant International is nothing more than the continuation of the Peasant Pan-Russian Federation founded in 1899 and which in 1904 had thirty million members. The acceptance of this motion to join was simply the expression of the confidence of the group in its president, on whom it absolutely relied.

According to our program the obligation to defend the country ceases only with death. For that reason we consider a good army a national necessity. We do, however, desire to attain in a constitutional manner a reduction of military service and a diminution in the number of military organizations. We believe that military service should include the execution of useful public works, with a view to relieving the people of unnecessary expense.

After making this declaration Mr. Radich invited his hearers to take their choice between "a policy of strike" and "a policy of accord."

Contributors to This Issue

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH, *The Nation's* dramatic critic, has lived most of his life in Knoxville, Tennessee. He is in Dayton for the Scopes trial.

CRYSTAL EASTMAN, writer on feminist subjects and formerly editor of the *Liberator*, is living in London.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON, of Ginn and Company, was formerly pastor of an orthodox church near Plymouth, Vermont.

LEON HERALD (SERABIAN) is a young Armenian, a former student at the University of Wisconsin.

REXFORD GUY TUGWELL is assistant professor of economics at Columbia University and editor of several volumes on economic subjects.

GLEN MULLIN is an artist and writer, author of "The Adventures of a Scholar Tramp."

CHARLES A. BENNETT wrote "At a Venture," a book of philosophical essays.

JOHAN J. SMERTENKO is directing the publishing house of Alfred A. Knopf in Mr. Knopf's absence.

PITTS SANBORN is a New York music critic.

HAMILTON FISH ARMSTRONG is managing editor of *Foreign Affairs*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED